[Registered at the General Post Office as a Newspaper.

The Nonconformist.

THE DISSIDENCE OF DISSENT AND THE PROTESTANTISM OF THE PROTESTANT RELIGION.

Vol. XXXVII.—New Series, No. 1581. LONDON: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1876. Price { WITH SUPPLEMENT UNSTAMPED ..... 5d. / STAMPED ..... 5½d.

CONTENTS.

Ecclesiastical Affairs:
The Debate on Mr. O. Morgan's Resolution 221
Notes on Friday's Debate 221
The Disestablishment Movement 222
Correspondence:
The Home Secretary and Town Cemeteries 223
The Burials Question.... 223
The British and Foreign Bible Society..... 223
The Burials Question.—Debate in the House of Commons 223
Leading Articles:
Summary 233
Administrative Corruption in the United States 233
Oxford University Bill 234
Sketches from the Gallery 234
Religious and Denominational News 235
Literature:
Grote on Ethics 235
Mr. McColl's Defence... 236
The Habitations of Man 236
The Magazines for March 237
Epitome of News..... 238
Funeral of the late Dr. Spence..... 238
Gleanings 238
Supplement.

Ecclesiastical Affairs.

THE DEBATE ON MR. OSBORNE MORGAN'S RESOLUTION.

The debate on the resolution on the subject of Interments in Parochial Churchyards, submitted by Mr. Osborne Morgan to the House of Commons on Friday night, will be read, we suspect, by average Englishmen some twenty or even ten years hence with wonder mingled with humiliation. The division which closed it will excite, perhaps, those emotions still more deeply. One is tempted to ask whether it can be true that we have entered upon the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Some of the sentiments uttered in seemingly good faith by men in high political position in the course of the discussion were so narrow, so artificial, so utterly devoid of statesmanlike foresight, as to throw an air of unreality over the whole debate. Notwithstanding what appeared to be the sincerity of speakers in opposition to Mr. Morgan's resolution, it is extremely difficult to realise the feeling which they evinced as growing out of their view of the merits of the case. Mr. Cross's speech, able, and sometimes verging upon eloquence, as it must be admitted to have been, reads more like an apology for an awkward position, and an attempted justification of a decision forced upon the Government by unmanageable political supporters, than an argument founded on justice and equity; and that of the Prime Minister was so evidently an intellectual escapade, as to suggest the probability that if he had been left to his own judgment and had not been exposed to the exacting pressure of clerical allies, he would have tendered very different counsels to the House.

Mr. Osborne Morgan's opening speech was most effective in the substantial matter which it contained, and admirably conciliatory in the tone which pervaded it. He lifted the question, which in itself is comparatively trivial, into a more elevated plane than that upon which party discussions are wont to proceed. He set forth his case with a persuasiveness that under ordinary conditions would be deeply felt, and which in the long run, we are convinced, will be found to have told powerfully upon Parliament as well as upon the country. He was greatly aided by the speech of Mr. Walter, whose analysis of the arguments which he had been obliged one by one to give up as untenable, and of the process by which he was finally brought abreast of the resolution before the House, could hardly have been more satisfactory to its supporters. Mr. Walter spoke as a man constrained by judgment and good feeling to deal with the question simply upon its merits. According to one of the current phrases of the time he "had the courage of his convictions;" and with a calmness to be envied, and a dignity sure to command respect, he turned the case of the opponents to the resolution inside out, and showed the emptiness of the claims put forward for the exclusive use of the service of the Church of England, and on behalf of the exclusive pretensions of the clergy of that Church, with a completeness not often witnessed in Parliamentary debate. His remedy for the grievance—the placing of parish churchyards under purely civil authority—is the true and simple solution of the problem. The discussion was almost entirely restricted to Churchmen, but one Dissenter, Mr. Leatham, having taken part in it, and Mr. Richard, whom we should have been glad to hear, having failed in several attempts to catch the Speaker's eye. On the whole, however, the weight and worth of argument was decidedly in favour of Mr. O. Morgan's resolution, and we cannot for a moment doubt that the main tendency of this animated debate will largely contribute to the formation of a sound public opinion on the question.

As was to have been expected, both sides of the House, in treating upon the question, came more or less in contact with that of Disestablishment. The argument of the Home Secretary reduced the National Church to the proportions of a favoured sect. He claimed that institution for Churchmen alone. He seemed to deem it their exclusive property. He talked of it as their rightful inheritance. He regarded all encroachment on their privelege of legal possession as in the nature of persecution. Their susceptibilities were, of course, to be primarily consulted. Their apprehensions were to be removed. The prejudices which had been instilled into their minds by ecclesiastical supremacy, inconsistent as they might seem with the dictates of common-sense, common justice, and common charity, were what the State was bound to regard. The churchyards belonged to them. The service prescribed by law was the service which they preferred. The "consecration" which separated "God's Acre" from the unconsecrated soil by which it was surrounded, invested it with a spiritual significance, and Mr. Cross left it to be inferred that any intrusion of Nonconformist piety into that area would reflect upon their consciences a painful wound. Such was his main argument—an argument utterly incompatible with that claim to nationality which the Church Establishment of this country of necessity involves. Put in short, it means this. "Legal supremacy in matters of religion is ours by law. Any effort to infringe upon that supremacy in favour of equality is a wrong done to us. Right or wrong, in virtue of our exclusiveness, we are bound to resist the aggression."

Mr. Disraeli based his opposition to the resolution upon other grounds. We take no notice of his preamble drawn from a sanitary view of the question under discussion. It may have indicated, it probably did, the direction in which he is looking out for a remedy to the evil complained of, but it can hardly be said that it was relevant to the question before the House. A large number of our churchyards may be full, but the dispute turns, not upon the right to burial in them, for that is legally assured to every parishioner, but upon the kind of ministration which shall be permitted therein. He was more effective when he asserted the object in view as a part of a general and far-sighted plan aiming at the disestablishment of the Church of England. It was his cue, as it has frequently been before said, to depict in strong but respectful terms the growing power of the Liberation Society, the subtlety and self-restraint of their strategical movement, and the vigilance with which it was necessary to guard against their further progress and their ultimate success. He did not seem to see, however, that he was effectually playing their game. The rejection of the resolution will put into their hands a powerful instrument, by identifying the Church Establishment with an exclusion of Dissenting ministrations from parochial churchyards. He chose the worst possible ground upon which for his clients to fight the greater battle. The sympathies of thousands which, for some time, might have been withheld from us, will be thereby thrown upon our side. If the fate of the Church Establishment is to be thus linked with exclusively Church services in our parochial burial-places, its downfall will come all the more certainly and the more swiftly. Concession alone can partially and temporarily disarm our ranks. The policy of "no surrender," if it be but adhered to, will wonderfully strengthen our hands in the prosecution of the momentous result we are aiming to secure

NOTES ON FRIDAY'S DEBATE.

Apart from the main line of argument in the debate of Friday evening, there were a number of isolated points in several speeches which may be instructive, or at any rate amusing, to recall. One of these was the logical alarm of Mr. Cross when he insisted that in spite of Mr. Osborne Morgan's disclaimer, "the right—the absolute right—to burials in the churchyard is precisely the same as the absolute right of the parishioners to the service within the church itself." "It would be absolutely impossible," he added, "if they were consistent with their votes, to resist the one if they passed the other." It is no business of ours to dispute the assumption involved here, that the path of religious justice is the path of disestablishment. There is not the slightest doubt that this is so; and we are very glad that Mr. Cross has conceded so much. At the same time there are very real grounds in the nature of the case for treating the question of burials apart from the more general one; grounds which it is desirable that both Conformists and Nonconformists should clearly understand. It may be perfectly true that as public property parochial churches are in precisely the same case as parochial graveyards. Nevertheless, there are some differences between the two in addition to the indisputable distinctions pointed out by Mr. Morgan, that whereas death and burial are physical necessities a share in national religious rites is not so. It is easier, for instance, to understand that superstitious susceptibilities should be offended by alien religious ceremonies in a consecrated building than by the same in the surrounding precincts. The Jews were very jealous indeed of the intrusion of any foreigners within the Temple area. And yet even they had a Court of the Gentiles where St. Paul might have disputed with Greek philosophers as freely as in the Athenian Agora. Nay, even the devout Catholicism of Austria and the stolid Orientalism of Russia both of them allow Protestant rites on sacred ground, although in sacred buildings such a thing would be abhorrent. Nay, it is an actual fact that there is no legalised Angelican ceremony for the consecration of graveyards. Bishops of the most orthodox character have often contented themselves with signing the needful documents. And there is an overwhelming probability, amounting almost to certainty, that the vast majority of

our parochial graveyards have never been consecrated at all, which no one will suppose to have been the case with the churches. We insist, therefore, that setting on one side all question of absolute right, we are not putting the same strain upon Episcopalian sentiments of exclusiveness in demanding admission to the churchyards as we should if we presumed so far as to ask the use of the sacred buildings for the performance of any funeral service. Indeed, as was well urged by several speakers on the authority of the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, the refusal of this very moderate concession shows the Anglican Establishment to be less amenable on this subject to the influences of charity than those churches which are usually regarded as the emblems of bigotry and spiritual tyranny.

Again, Mr. Cross's indignant appeal to liberty and conscience showed a very strange oblivion of the distinction usually insisted on by his friends between a church and a sect. "Practically," he said, "it would come to this, that the members of the Church of England were the only religious body within these realms who could not appropriate the churchyard for the exclusive use of themselves." "You may talk of liberty," he cried, "and you may talk of conscience, but I should take that to be the greatest tyranny." These noble sentiments were duly applauded by honourable members for the Church, who little thought of the sad heresy they were endorsing. Is it come to this, then, that the members of the Church of England are only a "religious body," and one amongst many others "within these realms"? Nonconformists have for many years had a dim notion that such was the fact; but have always been incontinently snubbed for their blunder-headedness in daring to say so. Some few years ago a Nonconformist mayor of a provincial town was waited upon by a zealous clergyman, who asked for a subscription to some new church-buildings. The mayor was not disinclined to show practical sympathy, but thought it a good opportunity of airing his own ideas of true Catholicism. "How pleasant it would be," he observed, if the ministers of our body and those of your body"—The clergyman threw up his hands in horror—"For heaven's sake," he cried, "don't call us a body," and disappeared without waiting for his subscription. Yet here we have no less a person than the Home Secretary of a Government which is nothing if not "on the side of the angels" and the Church, humbly acknowledging that he and his fellow-Episcopalians are nothing more than a "religious body," like the Methodists or the Baptists. Well, if this be the case, all we can say is that this religious body enjoys rather greater privileges under our present constitution than can be considered at all fairly due either to its numbers or to its practical work. But the difficulty pointed out by Mr. Cross as to what he considered the probably unfair operation of the Burials Bill in regard to new churchyards provided by voluntary subscription arises solely from the fact that neither law nor custom will allow the Church of England to be regarded or treated as a "religious body" at all. Whoever gives a churchyard to the Establishment gives it, not to a "religious body," but to the nation; and, as the law at present stands, such a new gift must necessarily follow the fortune of the old parochial burial-grounds. If Mr. Cross complains of the injustice of this, he would do well to join with those who are seeking to induce the Church of England to give up its futile pretensions to identity with the nation, and frankly to accept the position of a "religious body."

Mr. Raikes also said some things which were noteworthy, though scarcely for any additional strength that he gave to the cause he advocated. "With regard to the law of the case, he thought it was still open to them to hold that there was no such thing as a common law right of sepulture apart from the question of the Burial Service of the Church of England. The two rights went together." The language seems to indicate some ambiguity in the speaker's mind, and it is possible we may not rightly apprehend him. If he meant that the common law cannot set aside the Act of Parliament which imposes the use of the Prayer Book service, the thing is so obvious that it was scarcely worth saying. But if he meant that the parishioners' right to burial in his parochial ground, and the duty incumbent upon his relatives of accepting the Anglican service, were of precisely the same constitutional origin and force, we must entirely demur. As he fairly acknowledged, the right to burial is not the creation of statute, it belongs to that unwritten law, the origin of which goes back to the unrecorded beginnings of the English people. Under the most Catholic kings, as well as under the secular popery of Henry VIII., that right existed just as much as it does now. But the origin of law of the burial service was entirely different. And what we say is, that when the law of the burial service was altered by statute, the legislators of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries unjustly considered the interests of only one of the divergent schools of religious thought into which the life of the nation was branching out. We say that an objectionable statute, the Act of Uniformity, interferes to contract the catholicity of the Common Law, and we demand that, so far at least, the statute law shall be neutralised. Mr. Raikes was even more unfortunate in his reference to the supposed jealousy of Nonconformist ministers, the petty cause to which he traced the whole agitation. "He did not blame them," he said. "The feeling was natural to their position. It did not follow, however, that they were to change the law." Now, to us it seems to follow very naturally indeed. If Nonconformists are suffering under disabilities productive of a resentment which even Mr. Raikes does not and cannot blame, surely there must be something rotten in the ecclesiastical state of the country.

THE DISESTABLISHMENT MOVEMENT.

MR. GORDON'S MEETINGS.

Huddersfield.—On Monday evening last week Mr. Gordon lectured in the Armoury, Huddersfield, in reply to speeches at a great Church Defence meeting held in the same large hall some time before. Wright Mellor, Esq., J.P., presided, and there was a magnificent attendance, and the proceedings were sustained throughout with unwonted enthusiasm. Mr. Gordon's points were received with rounds of hearty cheering, and his quick, instant replies to a long series of questions greatly pleased the meeting. Enthusiastic votes of thanks were given to the lecturer and chairman, both of whom had received a very hearty greeting. In the view of friends present, this was one of the best meetings that had been held in Huddersfield for some years.

Swinton, near Manchester.—On Tuesday evening Mr. Gordon replied to a recent lecture by the secretary of the Northern Church Defence Association, in the Public Hall, Pendlebury, near Manchester, the Rev. E. Harrison in the chair. There was again a large and attentive audience, who were specially interested in the replies to numerous questions. It was a capital meeting.

Clitheroe.—On Wednesday evening Mr. Gordon was down for the Public Hall, Clitheroe, and another terrible time he had of it. Some time before the time announced for opening the doors they were broken in by a Church and Tory mob, who speedily packed the larger portion of the place, a large hall, including most of the platform, stairs to the same, and so on. There they sat and stood, and sang a hymn about their love for the dear old Church, having been specially printed for their use on the occasion. The chairman, Mr. Hargreaves, and the lecturer and friends were received with a storm of yells, hoots, and groans, and, for an hour, the whole thing went on in like manner, chairman and lecturer doing little more than maintaining a sort of dumb show. Once or twice it seemed as if Mr. Gordon was going to get the better of them, as, for instance, when he beat time, ironically, of course, for the singers, and they could not stand that, and gave up, but then they seemed to see that they were being beaten, and began a fresh diversion. Beer bottles were swung to and fro, and the old alliance of Church and barrel seemed once more realised, and there were a few sharpish physical conflicts. All this time two Tory magistrates, and, at least, one clergyman, stood by, and said not a word to quell the disturbance, although a word would have been enough, as the magistrates were large employers of labour. At length Mr. Gordon gave up, saying that they would come again, and again, and again till they were heard; and, by-and-bye, after some dangerous moments, he and the chairman, and Mr. Alexander and friends, were seen out of the hall, and to their lodgings, by the police, amidst the groans and yells of a following mob, with, now and then, a few sods. It was a shameless scene in every respect, and woe to the cause that fancies it finds safety herein!

Penrith.—On Thursday evening, Mr. Gordon lectured in the Market Hall, Penrith, Mr. Macdougall presiding. There was an excellent audience, though the opposition seemed to have had enough of it, and were conspicuous by their absence. The lecture was received with loud applause, and a hearty vote of thanks given to Mr. Gordon. A good stroke of work has lately been done in this bonnie old Cumberland town.

Millom, West Cumberland.—On Friday evening, Mr. Gordon was back again, and lectured in the Town Hall, Millom, near Barrow. The Rev. Mr. Hender presided, and there was a fair audience, including the Roman Catholic priest, who listened with great interest to Mr. Gordon's statements. A few opponents retired early. No opposition beyond their speedily-suppressed hisses. Good resolution carried, and the usual votes.

Previous to the Huddersfield meeting, Mr. Gordon met a few friends to tea at Dewsbury, and was presented with a very beautiful silver cup—as he said, "like the Establishment, more for ornament than use"—in recognition of his recent services in the debate there.

Public Meeting in Leicester. — A well-attended meeting was held in the large Temperance Hall of this town on Monday evening, Feb. 28, in vindication of the principles of religious equality as applied to the national churchyards. Alderman Chambers presided, and many other members of the corporation—seven aldermen and nine councillors—were present, and most of the Nonconformist ministers of the town. The demands upon our space this week quite preclude us from doing justice to the meeting, which is reported at length in the local *Chronicle*. The first resolution, moved by the Rev. J. P. Mursell, was as follows:—"That this meeting, having heard of the decease of Mrs. Edward Miall, hereby expresses its earnest sympathy with Mr. Miall in his bereavement, and requests the chairman to address to him a letter of condolence on its behalf." Mr. W. Baines seconded the resolution, which was carried in silence. The next resolution (which appeared in our advertising columns last week) had reference to the Burials question, and heartily endorsed Mr. Osborne Morgan's resolution. It was moved in a vigorous speech by Mr. John Bennett, of Kirby Muxloe, and cordially seconded by the Rev. A. Burgess (Wesleyan). Mr. John Fisher, of the Liberation Society, followed with an address full of information on the subject, and exposing the futility of the various alternative schemes to Mr. Morgan's proposal. Mr. J. A. Picton, M.A., formerly of Gallowtree-gate Chapel, Leicester, received a most cordial welcome on rising. His speech dealt mainly with the disendowment question in connection with the recent returns of Lord Hampton, the retarding action of the Church in education, and its injurious influence in thwarting political progress. In conclusion, Mr. Picton expressed the hope that the working classes might manifest and celebrate their political maturity by the overthrow of an ancient wrong which, more than any remaining inheritance of the dark ages, paralysed the energy, poisoned the peace, and seared the conscience of the English nation. (Cheers.) On the motion of the Rev. A. F. Macdonald it was decided to send the Burials resolution to Mr. Osborne Morgan and the political leaders, and a vote of thanks to the deputation and the chairman brought the proceedings to a close.

The Oxford University Bill.—We wish to call the special attention of our readers to the important resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the Liberation Society in regard to this measure which appear in our advertising columns. They point out in detail, not only the defectiveness of the measure in respect to those points in which Nonconformists are most deeply interested, but that the bill has been so framed as expressly to perpetuate those ecclesiastical restrictions which, unfortunately, were not removed by the Act of 1871. Those who remember the vigour, the intelligence, and the success with which the Liberation Society has dealt with the University Tests question for so many years, will not doubt that it will do its best at this important juncture; but, under existing circumstances, it will require the most energetic action to get Lord Salisbury's bill into the shape which it ought to assume.

The Oxford Commissioners.—According to the London correspondent of the *Leeds Mercury* the names of Mr. Gladstone, Lord Selborne, the Dean of Christ's Church, Mr. Ridley, M.P., and Mr. Mowbray, M.P., are mentioned in connection with the proposed University Commission.

The Emperor and Empress of Germany gave an audience on Tuesday, Feb. 20, to the Rev. James Davis, secretary of the Evangelical Alliance. Their Majesties expressed to him the great interest they felt in that society.

A bill brought into the House of Commons by Mr. James Barclay has been printed, which has for its object to remove the exemption of parish ministers in Scotland from payment of poor rates and education rates.

Lord Salisbury's Bill.—Lord Colchester (a high Tory) will move, on the second reading of this bill, "That this House regrets that any legislation should be undertaken in reference to either University, except after a more extended and comprehensive inquiry than fell within the scope of the recent Royal Commission."

The Clifton Sacrament Case.—Mr. Jenkins, the appellant in the case of "Jenkins *v.* Cook," attended the communion at Christ Church, Clifton, on Sunday morning, and received the sacrament at the hands of the curate, the Rev. Mr. Stowe. The Rev. Flavel Cook is at Torquay. His resignation has been received, but will not be signed by the bishop until Mr. Cook has complied with some legal formalities with reference to the payment of costs.

Another Threatened Ritualist Prosecution.—We (*Stamford Mercury*) understand on good authority that the Rev. C. Bodington, who lately held a mission in Holy Trinity, Gainsborough, is to be prosecuted under the Public Worship Regulation Act for alleged ritualistic practices. Mr. Bodington is vicar of St. Andrew's, Wolverhampton; but the acts complained of are not so much those in his own church as in that of Christ Church, which is

in Mr. Bodington's parish, and over which he has ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

A CASE IN POINT.—At the meeting of the Liverpool Burial Board held last week it was said that since the cemetery was opened upwards of 2,000 interments had annually taken place, and the burial services had been read by clergymen of the Church of England and by Dissenting ministers, as well as by Roman Catholic priests; but in no one case had there been any scenes of disorder, though there was but a gravel walk between those portions of the cemetery allotted to the religious bodies referred to.

RESIGNATION OF A RITUALIST CLERGYMAN.—The Rev. C. Parnell, of St. Margaret's, Liverpool, has resigned his incumbency, on one ground—among others—that his going away "will conduce to peace in the town." Proceedings have been taken in the courts against the rev. gentleman on account of the extremely "High" character of the services of St. Margaret's; but he informed his congregation on Sunday, in the most explicit terms, that his resignation was not in any way connected with the prosecution. Still less was it due, he said, to any dissatisfaction with the present condition of the English Church, which, "though sorely tried," has, he believes, a glorious future before her.

TURKISH PERSECUTIONS IN SYRIA.—Lord Derby on Friday received a deputation from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, who called attention to the persecution of Christians in Syria. The Foreign Secretary did not deny the strength of the case made out, and expressed a hope that Turkish statesmen would have the sense to see that a system of persecution and ill-usage of the Christian population would naturally be a cause of internal decay, which would be fatal to the existence of the Turkish empire. It was quite possible that there may have been at Constantinople some misunderstanding on the subject, and he should ask Sir Henry Elliott to make a strict and searching inquiry into the whole matter.

"THE BETTER PART OF VALOUR IS DISCRETION."—The *Church Times*, an organ of the Ritualists, reviews the position of the Ritualists as affected by the recent Privy Council judgment, and comes to the conclusion that the "Catholic" party ought neither to secede from the Church, nor to submit to the courts. A second attempt to form another Church would fail as ignominiously as that of the nonjurors did. The *Church Times* seems to rely upon the contingency of the persecutors getting weary of persecuting, and thinks that if "Catholics" will but persevere in the condemned practices, they will eventually obtain for them the same tacit sanction which is given to practices that fifteen years ago excited so lively a controversy, but which are now generally adopted.

SECESSION OF A BAPTIST MINISTER TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—On Sunday evening week, at the close of the usual service, the Rev. T. G. Swindill, who for the last two years has been the pastor of Sansome-walk Baptist Chapel, Worcester, intimated his resignation of his office as minister, and his intention of joining the ministry of the Church of England. In a very short statement he gives as his chief reasons for so doing that "having come to see that, as infants are within the compass of salvation, baptism, the sign and pledge of this fact, cannot be denied them, and that having been his chief reason for his Nonconformity, and far from admiring the polity of Dissenting church government, which often tends to disorder and to the unrest of the minister, he intended to enter the ministry of the Church." Mr. Swindill was formerly of Windsor and Regent's Park College.

THE TOMBSTONE AT OWSTON.—In the House of Commons on Thursday, Mr. Watkin Williams (in the absence of Mr. Waddy), asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it was true that the Vicar of Owston had caused a tombstone in the churchyard to be taken up and turned round, and placed close to another tombstone so as to conceal the inscription upon it, solely because the said inscription contained the following words,—"A consistent member of the Wesleyan Society upwards of sixty years." Mr. Cross could only say that he had received a letter from the Vicar of Owston in which he stated that the tombstone in question was in the position in which it was placed nearly fifty years ago, facing eastwards; that there was no member of the family now living in the parish; that ten years ago the same grave was used for the interment of persons belonging to another family; and that the new tombstone obscured the old one. That, he thought, was a great pity; but if the facts were as stated in the question, it would be a very improper proceeding.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT ON THE BURIALS DEBATE.—On Saturday Mr. Jacob Bright addressed a large meeting, held in St. Michael's Ward, Manchester, to celebrate his return at the late election. Referring to the Liberal reaction which recent elections seemed to indicate, he said he had no anxiety for an immediate change, believing a change would come as soon as the Liberal party were prepared for it. They wanted, however, a little better common understanding, a little more union throughout the country, and, in his opinion, a little more faith in their principles, and somewhat more earnestness. Alluding to the debate on Friday night on the Burials Bill, he remarked that the speech of Mr. Disraeli was one of the most interesting of the evening, so thoroughly characteristic of the man, and so painful, he (Mr. Bright) should imagine, to the men who sat behind him. The *Times* had told them that with such a division and such a debate the question might be supposed to be practically settled; and if there were any clergy of the Church of England who could not live in happiness and see their poor neighbours enjoying the same privileges as the members of the Church of England, he (Mr. Bright) thought they had better make arrangements to put themselves in some other situation. (Applause.)

THE WESLEYANS AND DISESTABLISHMENT.—Disestablishment is the one great political question of the future. It is a question in which all Wesleyans are free to decide for themselves; and they are making up their minds very rapidly. The majority of Wesleyans and Wesleyan ministers are perhaps now Dissenters. But that is no reason why at every district meeting and in every Conference we should be passing resolutions in favour of disestablishment. The Conference can only take up the question of disestablishment as a religious question. If ever the overwhelming majority of Wesleyan ministers and laymen become convinced that the Establishment as a whole is destroying the Protestantism of the country, there will be no difficulty in obtaining a Conference vote in the direction of disestablishment. A resolution in favour of disestablishment might be passed at the very next Conference without any violation of the Deed Poll, for by that Magna Charta of our rights John Wesley has left us independent of the Church of England for ever. But the time for such action is not yet. The Providence of God will indicate to us our duty. In the present state of Methodist feeling and opinion it would be a divisive and unprovidential act for the Conference to vote for disestablishment. But let the thousands of our Israel in their individual capacity as citizens do as they please outside the Methodist organisation.—*Watchman.*

Correspondence.

THE HOME SECRETARY AND TOWN CEMETERIES.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—In the debate on Mr. Morgan's resolution on the burial question of last Friday, the Home Secretary is reported to have said:—

That there has been a great increase in the number of cemeteries formed, especially in the last ten years. These cemeteries all had portions consecrated and portions unconsecrated, and the number buried in the former far exceeded the number in the latter, and the majority of those not connected with the Church preferred to use its service.

So far as this neighbourhood is concerned the facts are quite in the opposite direction, as the numbers buried in the cemetery here up to the present time are—on the Church side, 16,973; on the general side, 31,165—and this notwithstanding that all paupers are by Act of Parliament considered members of the Established Church, and therefore buried in holy ground. Thus a fee is secured to the minister of the parish from whence the body is brought, although the paid chaplain on the ground reads the service.

I am, Sir, your obediently,
THOS. B. TYETH.

Plymouth, March 6, 1876.

THE BURIALS QUESTION.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

DEAR SIR,—The position of this question at the present moment seems to be as follows:—The right of burial is admitted, and the right of *silent* burial granted, and recommended at, I believe, every meeting of the clergy. The law as it stands prohibits, under pains and penalties, the offering of prayer to Almighty God by any other than the State priests. Under these circumstances, I ask, would it not be right for Nonconformists to offer prayer in disregard of such a law? I incline to think so.

Yours truly,
H. H.

Wallingford, March 5, 1876.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.

To the Editor of the Nonconformist.

SIR,—Mr. B. H. Cowper is a little hasty in his conclusions. He complains that this society, by advertising for "a competent scholar, graduate of an English University," as editorial superintendent, is guilty of "an unusual and illiberal limitation," in excluding "America and the continent, as well as Ireland and Scotland, and practically all Dissenters from the Episcopal Church."

Will you allow me the pleasure of informing him:—1st, that the committee certainly did not contemplate the appointment of a foreigner. 2nd, that "English" was meant to include Irish and Scotch, and has been so understood by various applicants. 3rd, that as most people are aware, Nonconformists have for many years been admitted to degrees at Oxford and Cambridge and always at London; and that several of the applicants *are* Nonconformists. 4th, that if the committee wished to exclude Irishmen, Scotchmen and Dissenters, it is a little strange they should insert the advertisement in papers like the *Scotsman* and the *Nonconformist*, where Mr. Cowper will find it this week, if I mistake not; though to meet his scruples and throw the field entirely open the word "English" is omitted.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
S. B. BERGNE, Secretary.

146, Queen Victoria-street, March 3, 1876.

THE BURIALS QUESTION.

DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On the motion that the House go into committee of supply on Friday night, Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN rose, amid cordial cheers on the Liberal side, to move the following amendment:—

That, the parish churchyards of England and Wales having been by the common law of England appropriated to the use of the entire body of the parishioners, it is just and right, while making proper provision for the maintenance of order and decency, to permit interments in such churchyards either without any burial services or with burial services other than those of the Church of England, and performed by persons other than the ministers of that Church.

The hon. and learned member said: Before moving the resolution, I think it is my duty to offer the House some explanation of the reasons which have induced me to deviate from the course usually pursued on occasions of this kind. That explanation is short and simple. I came down to the House on the first day of session prepared to do what has been done for four or five years—namely, to bring in a bill to amend the burial laws; but Fortune, which has hitherto smiled upon me, was not propitious this year; and, thanks partly to the irrepressible thirst for legislation which has seized on private members, principally from the other side of the Channel, I found myself crowded out. If I had persevered in my determination to bring in a bill, I should have been remitted to the Derby-day or to the second place on the second Wednesday in July. Under these circumstances I made a virtue of necessity, withdrew my bill, and determined to proceed by resolution. I am not sure that I have any reason to complain of the accident which drove me to this. Resolutions have sometimes led to useful results. I believe it was a resolution which first paved the way to the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, and I know that in later times resolutions have been fraught with equally momentous consequences. Whatever may be the ultimate effect of passing such a resolution as mine, I may express a hope that the calmer and wider discussion which an abstract resolution involves may clear away some of the prejudices which still overlie this question, and may place it on a truer and sounder footing. That, at any rate, will be my object in the observations which I shall have to address to the House, and if I fail I shall fail from want of ability and not from lack of honest endeavour. Before I proceed, I should like to make one preliminary observation, and that is that we now approach this question with an amount of light which was never thrown upon it before. It will be in the recollection of the House that when I brought forward my bill before, I was taunted with having brought forward a very small grievance. I think the Secretary of State (Mr. Cross) called it the minimum of a grievance. I have been told that it is not only a small grievance, but that it is one which grows "smaller by degrees and beautifully less," because it was said that every week old churchyards were being closed and new cemeteries opened. I thought that was an allegation which required testing, because it was altogether contrary to my personal experience. In the first place, my experience would lead me to say that the churchyards of England are by no means full, and that even where they are full, people do not at once rush off and form themselves into a burial board, and invoke all the cumbrous and expensive machinery of the Burials Acts. Some liberal landlord, not always a member of the Church of England, gives a neighbouring piece of land or perhaps the land is purchased by subscription, and in this way the churchyard is extended to meet the wants of the parish. However, the allegation was made, and I determined to test it. In June last I moved for a return giving the name and population of every parish in England and Wales, together with the number of churches and churchyards open or closed, consecrated burial-grounds or unconsecrated burial-grounds, and of the number of cemeteries. The return I asked for was so com-

plete that I am afraid it never will be completed, and therefore, for the present, at all events, I have had to content myself with information which is less exhaustive, but which nevertheless throws a great deal of light on the subject before us. When I went to the Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department I was treated with a degree of courtesy and kindness which I cannot sufficiently acknowledge. It is impossible for any Minister to do more toward a member of this House than the Under-Secretary of State did for me. (Hear, hear.) I went to my right hon. friend, and he told me that although he had done everything that he could to expedite returns, and to obtain them from the most trustworthy sources, a large number had not come in, and those which had come in were so voluminous that it would take six months to print them. All idea therefore of obtaining them during the present session had to be abandoned. I had therefore to turn the nominal return which I had asked for into a numerical one, and here it is; and it certainly throws on the subject an amount of light which I never expected. I should mention the returns were received from 7,369 parishes of England and Wales, but 2,332 parishes have supplied no information. Of course I have my own impressions as to the reasons why no information was sent in these cases. I have no reason to impute *mala fides*—but this I will say, that had the returns been all before us they certainly would not have been more unfavourable to my case than they are at present. (Hear, hear.) Wherever burial boards have been established, and are headed by responsible authority whose business it is to answer inquiries, information can be obtained, and wherever cemeteries have been constructed you have the information you want, and those portions of country from which no returns are made, are mainly the rural parishes, which, of course, would go to strengthen my case. A fuller return which was published to-day by the Home Office, which I suppose is from the Burials Office, differs very little indeed from the returns presented two days before. According to one return the number of consecrated burial grounds closed was 794, whereas according to the other the number was 843. When I come to Wales I find the number of parishes from which returns have been received is 541, and the number from which returns were not received is 204, shewing that two-fifths of the authorities there decline to give information. Taking the information I have got, it shews that the churchyards now open in England and Wales amount to 9,989—in round numbers 10,000, and the number closed amounts only to 794, so that the churchyards open in proportion to the churchyards closed are in the ratio of nearly 13 to 1. (Hear, hear.) I may add a significant fact which appears by the return this morning, that only sixty churchyards have been wholly closed in the last ten years, being an average of only six a year. When I come to cemeteries containing unconsecrated ground the results are still more marked. There are at present, so far as appears by this return, in England and Wales only 539 cemeteries available for Dissenters on unconsecrated ground. There was a return moved for by the hon. member for West Surrey, which contained the number of cemeteries constructed three years ago amounting to 531, so that in the course of three years only eight new cemeteries would appear to be have been constructed. Of course the places from which no returns have been received may swell these numbers, but I may state that these numbers must be taken with the fuller return we received this morning, which shows that only eight burial-grounds were closed within the last two years. So that the cemeteries available for Dissenters would seem to be only 539 as against churchyards which number nearly 10,000. (Hear, hear.) Of course you may say that cemeteries have been established in towns, and that Dissent is strongest in the towns. I am not at all sure that is so. The contrary would appear from one or two figures which are not set down in these returns, because I observe that in the county of Lincoln, a purely agricultural county, there are 634 Dissenting chapels. But whether that be true of England or not, it is not true of Wales, because there if the Church is strong at all, it is in the urban and not in the rural districts. Now I come to my own country—the Principality of Wales—and here the results are overwhelming. Taking Wales and Monmouthshire, which is Welsh in everything except name, we have, so far as appears by these returns, of churchyards open, 788; of churchyards closed, 25; and of cemeteries, 21—21 cemeteries for a scattered population of a million and a half. (Hear, hear.) The churchyards open to the churchyards closed are in the proportion of 31 to 1, and the churchyards open to the cemeteries open are 39 to 1. Take another case. In Anglesea, the most Nonconformist county in Wales, not a single cemetery is returned In Merionethshire there is one, Montgomeryshire, one; Flintshire, one; Carnarvonshire, one; and Denbighshire, three. This shows, so far as these returns go, that this grievance, so far from being a minimum—so far from extending only to a few hundreds or thousands of persons—extends to persons who may be counted by millions. Why, in North Wales alone therefore there are between 400,000 and 500,000 persons who feel the pressure of this grievance. The return also shows that while the number of chapelyards or burial-grounds attached to chapels in England and Wales and unconsecrated is 2,833 to 14,000 or only 20 per cent., the churchyards are to the churches in the proportion of 88 per cent. But I demur entirely to classing these burial-grounds, which are private property, and can be dealt with as such, in the same category as parish churchyards, within which every parishioner has a vested right of interment; for you cannot do so without admitting that the Church holds its property by the same title as a sect, in other words, without bringing it down to the level of a sect. I call attention to these figures because so much stress is laid on their absence by my opponents. For my own part I say that if a thing is just and right the number of persons who demand it is comparatively unimportant. (Hear, hear.) But I was challenged by the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister to produce this information. I have produced it, and all I can say is, I hope he is satisfied with the results. I now come to the resolution itself. It has been a long time before the House and the country, and of course it has been, I do not say unfairly, but it has been severely criticised. It was said by a leading journal that the preamble of the resolution was unnecessarily menacing. I hope I have lived long enough to know that menace of every kind, and particularly needless menace, is as injudicious in point of policy as it is reprehensible in point of taste. And as in the remarks I am about to make I hope not to wound the susceptibilities of any single member in this House, I do not care to insist upon the preamble if it is objected to; but in any case I wish this to be understood, that whether menacing or not it is most certainly true, and as it has been denied on high authority that the right to be buried in the churchyard is that of every parishionier, it is only fair that I should have an opportunity of demonstrating it as clearly as I can. Before entering on that part of the question, I must premise that there are two separate rights—a man's right of interment in the parish church, which is one thing, and the right to use the service of the Church of England, which is another. One is a civil and common-law right, triable by a civil court; the other is an ecclesiastical right, triable by the ecclesiastical courts. The latter is the right of those who are actual or constructive members of the Church of England. I say constructive, because the House knows that by a decision given about sixty years ago it was held that any person who had been baptised was constructively a member of the Church, and as such entitled to funeral service. This then is the right of the members of the Church of England. The right of interment is the right of everybody. It is the right of the Jew, the Turk, and the infidel, of everyone who has once obtained the rights of a parishioner in the parish. Let that be understood, because unless we separate these two rights we shall get into confusion. This has been admitted by a great ecclesiastical authority, the chancellor of one of our dioceses who certainly does not sympathise with my objects, but who writes thus:—

> It has been argued that the right of burial is the right of *Christian burial*, and that, therefore, those persons who are disqualified from Christian burial have no right to burial in the churchyard. But the more correct opinion seems to be that these rights are separable, and that the right of interment may exist where there is no right to require the performance of the Church service.

That the right of interment is the right of every parishioner, independently of religious status, is laid down without qualification in nearly every text-book, beginning with Bishop Gibson and ending with Sir R. Phillimore. But it does not rest on text-books. I have taken the trouble to look up the leading case of King *v.* Taylor on this subject, and I have obtained a note of that case from Sergeant Hill's MSS. in Lincoln's-Inn Library. It is to this effect:—

> A heretic parishioner having died in the parish of which one Tayler was rector, the parson Tayler ordered the sexton not to dig a place for her, and obstructed the burial of the corpse in the churchyard, he giving for reasons that she being a Protestant Dissenter, of the persuasion of the Baptists, was never baptized, and therefore ought not to be buried in the churchyard, which was consecrated ground. The matter being brought before the Court of King's Bench, Judge Fortescue said:—"*Every parishioner has a right to burial in churchyard, otherwise they cannot be buried anywhere if they have not land of their own*, for other persons are not obliged to permit their burial in their property."

The full court then said they would grant a criminal information (which was a very different thing then from what it is now), upon the ground *that every parishioner has a right of sepulture in the churchyard*. Defendant, however, saved them trouble by permitting the body to be buried, but he refused to read the service. This is important, as showing that the right of interment is entirely irrespective of the right of service. The matter was then again brought before the Court of King's Bench, but this time the court declined to interfere, saying, "As to refusing to read the Burial Service, that was a spiritual matter not belonging to them." This case has been followed several times, and I believe that the only man of any note who has doubted the proposition was the late Bishop of Exeter, and I might almost say of that case that the exception proves the rule. Then let us go a step further. Of course, the common law courts had nothing to do with rites and ceremonies. That was a matter which they left to the ecclesiastical courts, which having to deal with the question dealt with it in a liberal spirit. They laid down that every man who had been admitted into the Church by baptism, and had not been cut off by excommunication, was to be presumed to be a member of the Holy Catholic Church, and as such was entitled to be buried with the service of that Church—that being the only form of Christian burial then known in this country. But then that right was founded upon the assumption which was then true in fact a well as in theory—namely, that every parishioner *was* a member of the Holy Catholic Church. And that so far from there being any objection to Christian burial, the direst threat of that day was that of being interred without Christian burial: which was supposed to involve everlasting penalties. But what was then a fact has now become a fiction. Nobody supposes that Christian burial is necessary to salvation; at least, Nonconformists do not. But now just see what a change has come over the religious feeling of the country. The right now in question is one which was never dreamed of in the days of which I speak. It is not the right to refuse the services of the Church to those who want them, but the right to impose those services on those who do not want them—(cheers)—the right to force on unwilling ears a service which ceases to be solemn the moment it ceases to be welcome—(Hear, hear)—the right to lay violent hands on the funeral group and to force the corpse into the bosom of that Church which the living man had abjured. (Cheers.) Now, I put it to hon. gentlemen on that side as well as on this, does it not seem an insult to call this a party question? (Derisive cheers.) If that has wounded the susceptibilities of anyone, if it has wounded the susceptibilities of the hon. member for Bury St. Edmunds, I will withdraw it. (Laughter.) Why, this is a right we gave up forty years ago when we allowed Dissenters to marry with their own service. I know the answer that will be given to that. It will be said, "Yes, but we never admitted Dissenting ministers to our churches, but now you ask us to admit them to the churchyards. Churchyards are the same thing as churches, and if we admit you to one we must admit you to the other." I will endeavour to meet that objection because I feel the force of it entirely, and if hon. gentlemen will bear with me I will endeavour to meet it as best I can. (Hear, hear.) There is this distinction between the two cases—the object of the Church primarily is the performance of worship, the object of the churchyard is the interment of the dead, and while decency and convenience, if not necessity, requires that the dead should be interred in the same locality, nobody, not even the wildest Liberationist, has suggested that all religious ceremonies should be performed under the same roof. Take away the name and the juxtaposition and there is nothing in common between the church and churchyard, except possibly that both were included in the same ceremony of consecration. And perhaps the less we say about that the better, for it is now pretty generally agreed that the act of consecration is unauthorised if not illegal, because the ordnance on which it is founded is a bill which passed both Houses of Convocation in 1712, but when it came to Queen Anne, who was jealous of interference with her royal prerogative, she refused to give her sanction. Consequently the bill is in the position of a bill passed by both Houses, but which has not received the royal assent, that is to say it is mere waste-paper. That was why Bishop Thirlwall said he could consecrate a churchyard quite as well in his own study as elsewhere. As to the question of juxtaposition, that is a matter of recent origin, because I find it is stated by a great authority on ecclesiastical law that when Christianity was first introduced into England, and for many centuries afterwards, the graveyards, so far from encompassing the church, were at a great distance from it, and the contiguity was comparatively modern. In fact it is to be traced to the time when "monks and priests beginning to offer prayer for the souls of the departed procured leave, for their greater ease and profit, that liberty of sepulture might be in churches or places adjoining them, because to the friends and relatives of persons deceasing as often as they came to these sacred places seeing their graves, may remember them and pray God for them." And by an Act of Parliament which was passed some eight centuries after the introduction of Christianity into this kingdom, it is enacted that whereas—

> Of late by subtile imagination and by art and engine, some religious persons, parsons, vicars, and other spiritual persons have interred in divers lands and tenements which be adjoining their churches, and of the same have made churchyards, and by bulls of the Bishops of Rome have dedicated and hallowed the same, and in them do make parochial burying without licence of the king and of the chief lords, therefore it is declared that this is manifestly within the compass of the Statute of Mortmain.

But this is chiefly interesting from an antiquarian point of view; let us get to something more practical. I am willing to rest my case upon those two propositions, which I will proceed to state. I hold it to be quite clear that no man by any law, natural or human, is compelled to enter his parish church. But unfortunately there are several thousand parishes in England containing millions of inhabitants in which everyone is, at some time or other, compelled to enter his parish churchyard. Of course I do not mean territorial magnates who can build their own mausoleums. I am speaking of the poor who are compelled to be buried in the place where they die. Therefore to say, as is said by my hon. friend the member for Chester, that the use of the churchyard involves the use of the church, is a statement that really begins by ignoring the first law of poor human

nature, that we must all die and be buried. In fact, as an Irishman said to me the other day, "Burial is the one act in a man's whole life which is not optional." (Laughter.) If that be so, do we or do we not by our present law compel Dissenters to be buried with rites and ceremonies of which they disapprove? Do we or do we not compel them by our present law to be buried just as formerly we indirectly, but not on that account the less effectually, compelled them to get married with rites and ceremonies of which they disapproved? Again, if there can be but one answer to that question, let me ask another. Is that compulsion, indirect though it may be, consistent—I do not say with religious equality, because I never put this on the grounds of religious equality—but is it consistent with the barest measure of religious toleration? (Cheers.) Let me ask you to look around and see what is done in other countries. I stated some time ago that in almost every civilised country the law which I am endeavouring to introduce into this country already prevails. I was then contradicted, and I do not care to repeat the statement on my own authority. I will shelter myself under the authority of a man whom we all respect—I mean the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Archbishop of Canterbury stated on an occasion when my hon. friends, the members for the University of Cambridge and West Kent, were present, and subsequently in Convocation, that he had taken the greatest pains to ascertain what was the law of foreign countries on the subject, and he ascertained that in Austria and Russia—two countries not very remarkable for religious toleration—Protestant ministers were allowed to perform their own burial rites over their own flock. We know that in Ireland, first under Lord Plunket's Act, which gave a sort of permissive right, and secondly under Lord Emly's Act, which made the right absolute, both Presbyterian ministers and Catholic priests are allowed to perform their own Burial Service over their dead. We know that in Scotland, not by Act of Parliament, but, thanks to the more liberal spirit in which Scotchmen have looked at this question, not only Episcopalian clergymen (who are Dissenting ministers in Scotland) but Roman Catholic priests are allowed to bury in the graveyards. (Hear, hear.) Why should England be so far behind—I will not say Ireland and Scotland, but—Austria and Russia? (Hear, hear.) We boast enough of our position among nations. We go about thanking God that England is not as other nations are. We are justly proud of our religious toleration and liberty of speech. Why should we concede that liberty of speech at every other juncture except at that one juncture when it was most earnestly asked for and most sorely needed? Why should we concede it to every other subject of the realm, but deny it to the mourner, the widow, and the orphan? (Hear, hear.) I cannot but think that the consciences of hon. gentlemen opposite are not quite easy, because I see they have introduced no less than six bills to deal with this question. There are the two bills of Lord Beauchamp, and the two bills brought in by the hon. member for West Kent, a bill by the hon. member for Salford, and also a bill brought in by the right hon. member for the University of Cambridge. I now pass to the amendment. This amendment is actually the seventh red-herring you have drawn across my path. (Laughter.) I may tell the hon. member for West Kent that I entirely approve of it as an abstract proposition. But what has it got to do with my resolution? (Hear, hear.) If, by his amendment, he means that every facility should be given for so useful a purpose as the acquisition of land for burial-grounds, and that this shall be done as cheaply as possible, no sane man will disagree with him. (Hear, hear.) I may say, three years ago, before the hon. gentleman thought of the subject, I carried through Parliament an Act, now the 36 and 37 of the Queen, cap. 50, actually giving the facilities the hon. gentleman proposes to give to persons willing to bestow or sell land for burial-grounds. I would, therefore, suggest to my hon. friend that, instead of amending my resolution, he should amend my Act—which, I may remark, has been very useful—and he would have my most zealous co-operation. One does not like to boast of one's legislative performances, particularly of one so meagre and small as mine, but I may say that the only drawback to my satisfaction at being proposed has been that I have been so often called upon to explain its provisions. However, a number of sites of churches and chapels have been acquired under it, but I am not aware that it has ever been put into operation to acquire a single burial-ground. The reason is obvious. Unless burial-grounds are actually wanted the landowner does not want to give the land; the parishioners do not want to pay for it. If the hon. member means this—and I cannot help suspecting he does—if he means by his amendment that in every place, whether a churchyard is empty or full, whether cemeteries are wanted or not, there land shall be acquired for the purpose of making a burial-ground, all I can say that such a proposal, coming from a member of a party which has always prided itself on its resistance to any increase of the rates, is something monstrous. (Cheers.) Have you calculated the cost of this? I find that in the year 1862, when the last return was made, no less than 1,400,000*l.* had been expended in the acquisition of cemeteries, and of course the sum has been greatly increased since. If you were to cover the country with these cemeteries you would have to spend many hundreds of thousands of pounds, because it would not do, in my country at least, to have but one cemetery attached to each union, because the people might then have to drag a funeral ten or fifteen miles, and over high mountains. Now I want to know from what source is the money to come. Is it to come out of the rates? I think I see the president of the Local Government Board in his place, and, if so, I should be exceedingly glad to know what his views are. I do not see my hon. friend the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), who, to his honour, resigned a place in the Government to which he had been called by the voice of the House and with the assent of the country, because the Government could not keep pace with his views on local taxation. (Cries of "No, no," from the Conservative side.) I am sure if I have made a mistake I have done so innocently. It really does not matter. I want to know what the hon. member for South Norfolk, who is most zealous in his endeavours to cut down local expenditure, would say to such a proposal. My hon. friend opposite, the member for Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), has also distinguished himself by his attempts to cut down local expenditure. I should like to know whether my hon. friend the member for North Shropshire, as another farmers' friend, would have to say. Still more would I like to know what his constituents would have to say to it. To show how completely at sea people get when they come to carry these proposals into anything like practice, let me read to the House the results of a letter which the Bishop of Salisbury sent to his rural deaneries throughout the diocese, asking for opinions on the subject. The bishop says:—

About 600 clergy and representative communicant laity have given answers to the questions proposed. To the first question—whether the present law of burial should be uncompromisingly maintained—the answer is uniformly in the affirmative, two deaneries adding "as regards services." To the second question—whether, if any change were to be made, the proposals of Mr. Osborne Morgan's Bill should be accepted—the answer is absolutely in the negative; not more than three voted in the affirmative. To the third question—whether silent burials should be adopted according to Mr. Talbot's plan—three deaneries only answered in the affirmative, the divisions in them being 12 to 8, 9 to 7, and 12 to 3. To the fourth question—whether cemeteries should be formed for one or more parishes according to the recommendation of the Lower House of Convocation—two deaneries answered decisively in the negative; the rest answered in the affirmative, but with great variety of opinion as to the funds from which the cemeteries should be provided, several objecting to the charge falling on the rates, three proposing that it should be borne by the Dissenters, one that half should be defrayed by subscriptions, and half by a Government grant, and the rest not specifying the fund from which it should come.

That shows how utterly at sea you get the moment you come to answering questions as to the parochial working of a compromise on this question. What a Babel of discord does not Convocation become when they attempt to deal with this question. The Lower House sent a message to the Upper House, and the Upper House sent it back to know what it meant, and then they did what was perhaps the wisest thing, and postponed the consideration of the question until a more convenient season. It is a significant fact that although six bills have been brought forward to deal with this "infinitesmally small grievance," not one of those bills has ever been submitted to the full and ample consideration which every bill receives on coming up for second reading. (Hear, hear.) Not one of the authors has dared to submit his bill to the full and ample discussion which comes when a bill is read a second time. ("No, no," from the Ministerial side.) To a great extent the proposals which which have been made have been modified. I entirely acquit that hon. member for West Kent of any intention to do so, but surely he has not the slightest idea how deeply he wounded and pained the Nonconformists of England by his proposal for silent burial. It is true that by my resolution I proposed silent burials—("Hear, hear," from the Ministerial side)—but then I make them optional. I altered my resolution in accordance with the opinions of my Scotch friends, who say that it is the custom in Scotland to bury without any service. In England the silent interment is not a usual interment. Silent burial is the burial of the suicide, and consequently it imposes a stigma which makes people recoil from it. I am glad, therefore, that my hon. friend has dropped his proposal for silent interments. It comes to this, then, that you admit that something ought to be done, and yet you are not prepared to tell us what ought to be done. Have I not, therefore, a right to ask you to tell us a little more specifically what are your objections to my resolution. (Hear, hear.) Surely it is natural that a man should desire to be buried in a manner most consistent with his feelings? Surely it is natural that he should desire a funeral service to be performed over him by the man who had been his spiritual adviser through life, and who is to be the spiritual guide and consoler of his bereaved family? Surely that is a sentiment so natural, so human, that to look for its origin in what is somewhat vaguely called an outbreak of political Dissent, seems as ridiculous as it is unfeeling. (Cheers.) Then what is your objection? In that remarkable speech of the Prime Minister, delivered two years ago, he said that if Dissenters wanted to have the churchyards they ought to pay for them. Well, I entirely agree with that, and in my original bill I inserted a clause throwing the cost of keeping up the churchyards on the parishioners generally. But do not forget this, that although churchyards are now kept in order by Churchmen, many of them were originally constructed by rates borne by Dissenters as well as Churchmen. But I do not put this on a a pecuniary footing, because I do not attach much importance to that point of view. It is said there is no reciprocity about my resolution, and that it is one-sided, because it frees the Dissenting minister and binds the parson. That objection falls rather hard upon me, because it assumes that I am responsible for the Burial Service and the rubrics. You might as well say that I am responsible for the Thirty-nine Articles and the Athanasian Creed. (Laughter.) Do you not see how inconsistent you are, when you speak of compelling a Dissenter to have the Church Service performed over his remains you cannot see that there can be any objection to it? But when the question is as to compelling the parson to read it, then you discover that in many cases it is quite inapplicable. Well, I quite agree with you, but recollect there is such a thing as blowing hot and cold at once. Then there is another objection that there would be a danger of abuse. That is a horse which has been ridden very hard in the recess. One hon. member said that if the bill passed he should be afraid you would have Jumpers and Shakers in the churchyard; another was afraid of dancing girls. Another hon. member, the hon. member for Bedford, sees in imagination a vista of thirty or forty Mormon widows following their husband to the grave. (Laughter.) And now, it has been suggested that the Malay, after being relieved of the pressure of his domestic difficulties at Perak, will come over here and take advantage of the change of the law to pollute our churchyards with his horrid and obscene rites. (Renewed laughter.) Does any one believe this absurd nonsense? (Cheers.) I ask the question pointedly, because when I was as yet unversed in the ways of the world I, in order to guard against abuses, adopted almost every safeguard which had been suggested. The hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Talbot), had put down on my bill an amendment requiring the service to be either according to the prescribed ritual, or to consist of hymns and prayers and portions of Scripture. I accepted that amendment and put it in the bill of 1873, but no sooner had I done so than the hon. member began to quarrel with his own amendment. That bill of 1873 was the bill which the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister, came down to the House with all the weight and eloquence of his authority to denounce. Well! I am wiser now. Of course my resolution leaves the matter entirely open. It is not the office of a resolution to prescribe what service is to be performed or by whom. That is a matter necessarily left open. But if I am asked the question I will tell you frankly what safeguards I, speaking for myself alone, think necessary. None whatever. (Great cheering.) I think that is a matter you might safely trust to the good-sense and good-feeling of your fellow-countrymen. (Hear, hear.) Have you found any safeguards necessary in case of cemeteries in this country. (Hear, hear.) I have a great deal of evidence on the subject. I will give you a short extract from a letter put in my hands this morning from a member of the Burial Board of Liverpool. In that cemetery 60,000 people have been buried since it was first established:—"I have been a member of the burial board of this parish from its origin, and from the day of the opening of our cemetery at Anfield to the present, the Burial Services in the Nonconformist division of the ground have been conducted with at least as much decorum, if not more, than in the Church of England ground. The Church of England ground is bounded on one side by the Roman Catholic ground, and on the other side by the general or Nonconformist ground, being *separated only by open walks* or roads, and although the services at the grave-sides are often being conducted *at the same time* in each of the *three divisions*, all are conducted with order and decorum, and no occasion for complaint arises from one or the other of any irregularity." That is what the whole of my correspondents tell me—that the service in unconsecrated ground is just as devotional, just as religious in the true sense of the word, as the service in consecrated ground. Some go further, and say it is more so. If that be so, what are you afraid of? Why should you be more afraid of disturbances in churchyards than in cemeteries? Take Ireland. My hon. friends (the Irish members) will forgive me for saying that Irish funerals are not always conducted on the strictest principles of decorum. Has there ever been an instance of riot or indecorum at funerals in churchyards in Ireland? (An Hon. Member: "Yes.") Well, but are there no churchyard scandals under the present law in England? Look at Scotland. Has there ever been any riot in Scotland, where religious feeling runs at least as high as in England? I believe that last year the Episcopalian Bishop of Brechin and the Roman Catholic Bishop of Derry were laid to their rest in the churchyard of St. Cuthbert. Was there any riot? Then, I ask, what right have we to libel our fellow countrymen by insinuating that they alone among civilised men will be guilty of these outrages upon the feelings of the living and the memory of the dead? (Cheers.) But this is only the fringe of the question. (Hear, hear.) The real objection, we are told, lies deeper down—Disestablishment under disguise! (Ministerial cheers.) Well, I admire your unanimity, but I cannot say as much for your logic. As I understand the argument, it is put somewhat in this way: "You bring forward this motion;

you are in favour of disestablishment; therefore this is a motion in favour of disestablishment." (Laughter.) That is the syllogism. How am I to meet it? Indeed, the difficulty I have felt in arguing this question is that the grounds upon which I am called upon to argue it are continually shifting. No sooner do I raise one issue than you meet it by raising another. First it was the parson's freehold; then it was the smallness of the grievance; then it was the "danger of abuse"; and now it is "disestablishment under disguise." I really begin to feel like Lysander in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*:—

> He goes before me, and yet dares me on;
> When I come where he calls, then he is gone,
> Demetrius is much lighter heeled than I;
> I follow fast, but he doth faster fly.

Now, it is my belief that if, when that very moderate bill of 1873 was brought forward, the Prime Minister, instead of coming down to oppose it *a outrance*, had exercised the just and great control which he wields over his party, to "educate" them into something like reason on this subject, that bill might have been passed, this "great and burning question" might have been settled, and by this time we might almost have forgetten its existence. (Cheers.) But in an evil hour for the Church of England, in an evil hour for everybody—certainly in a very evil hour for me, some zealous but misgu'ded "children of the church,"[determined, in defiance of reason and logic, to confound the Church with the churcyard, to link the living with the dead, and to fight the battles of the Establishment upon this ground. Don't suppose that the Liberation Society quarrel with you for that. They know what an admirable weapon you have placed in their hands. They know that if they had been allowed to take their choice from the whole area of ecclesiastical questions they could not have selected a battle-ground more admirably adapted to their purpose than this. I have heard it said that this is to be the Thermopylæ round which you will fight to the last gasp for the entrance to the Church. Take care that your Thermopylae does not turn out to be the Caudine Forks. (Hear, hear.) The wisest men amongst you—the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Deans of Westminster and Durham, of Chester and Manchester, the headmasters of our great public schools, the leaders of thought at the universities—entirely decline to join you in your headlong and suicidal career. If opinions are to be weighed instead of reckoned, surely the memorial presented to the Prime Minister yesterday, signed by so many distinguished metropolitan and rural clergymen, ought to have some weight with the Government and the House. Unfortunately, however, all the leaders of ecclesiastical thought among us are not equally far-seeing. Let me read to the House the views on the subject by one of the most learned and active bishops of the English Church—a man of whose great scholastic and theological erudition I wish to speak with the greatest respect—I mean Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln; and I hope that every word will go forth to the House and to the country, not only because it is a very fair type of the arguments which are daily rained in upon me, but because I am continually told that the proper settlement of this question would be to do as was formerly done in Ireland—to leave each case as it arises to the discretion of the incumbent, with the right of appeal to the bishops. "A bishop," I am told, is always reasonable and always just. "Surely you can always trust a bishop?" Now let us see what chance an unfortunate Nonconformist would have of getting his appeal listened to in the large and important diocese of Lincoln. The Bishop of Lincoln, writing to one of the principal London newspapers a short time ago says:—

> "The bishops and clergy and parish priests of England are not the owners of the churchyards." So far we are entirely agreed. "They are only trustees of them under God, who is their proprietor, and they cannot, without breach of trust and without being guilty of a heinous offence in His sight, take away from God a single foot of a churchyard for the purpose of giving a share in it for public funeral services to persons who rend asunder His Church by schism, which is condemned by Him in His holy Word as a deadly sin. Such an act on the part of bishops and clergy would be a robbery of God. It would be an act of sacrilege, treachery, and cowardice. It would not avert Disestablishment; it would only hasten it."

Hasten disestablishment! Don't you think that such a letter as this—coming as it does from one of the most prominent prelates of our National Church—will do more to "hasten disestablishment" than all the Burial Bills that ever were invented? (Hear, hear.) Why, sir, these Church Defence Institutions have done more to pull down the Church of England in two years than the Liberation Society did in twenty. And why? Because they have alienated and are alienating from the Church of England that large body of Englishmen who don't know much and don't care much about theological dogmas, but who, nevertheless, entertain a deeply-rooted conviction that the first duty of a Christian Church is to be just and tolerant to her fellow-Christians. (Cheers.) And that is why I cannot help thinking that if she had been wise in her generation the Church of England, instead of hankering after impossible union with semi-barbarous Churches, would have looked nearer home, and herself have set to work to devise some scheme for relieving her own ministers from a position which is always false and often painful. (Hear, hear.) For, believe me when I say that, galling and irritating, and exasperating, as the prolongation of this wretched struggle undoubtedly is to the Nonconformists, the real sufferer by the prolongation of that struggle is the Church of England herself. We—my honourable friends and myself—can afford to look forward to the result of to night's division without the slightest misgiving. We know that by the aid of what I will venture to call a "mechanical majority" you can defeat this resolution. But we also know that the day will surely come when common-sense, and common justice—aye, and I may add, common humanity will prevail, as they always do in England, and when some measure, based upon the lines of this resolution, will become the law of the land. (Cheers.) Of that I, for one, am as sure as I am of my own existence. But is it quite so sure that the Church of England—strong though she be, deeply rooted in the affection of the people though she be—can much longer afford to be defended by such utterances as these?

> Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis
> Tempus eget.

But be that as it may, that is not the question upon which you will have to pronounce a verdict to-night. The question upon which you will have to pronounce a verdict to-night is not, I repeat, the disestablishment of the Church of England. It is a question infinitely smaller, both in its proportions and its consequences—a question, indeed, which, in this age of universal toleration I am almost ashamed to submit to the House of Commons—whether you will any longer tolerate this misty remnant of old ecclesiastical law, which, although it was perfectly just and perfectly suited to the age which gave it birth, has become so ill-suited to the changed religious condition of the country that it cannot be upheld without a fiction or enforced without an injustice.

Amid loud cheers, the hon. member concluded by moving his resolution.

Mr. WYKEHAM MARTIN, in seconding the resolution, said that on every occasion when the question of the disestablishment of the Church of England was before the House he had voted against it, and he did not deny that he had voted very reluctantly for the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland. (Ministerial cheers.) In the latter case, however, he felt its necessity; but he did not like it. Sir Morton Peto had once quoted the saying of one who was a Churchman among Churchman—he meant Lord Salisbury, when he sat in that House as Lord R. Cecil—to the effect that a bill such as that to which hon. gentlemen were so much opposed would come unless the clergy winked with both their eyes. (Hear, hear.) Well, he believed that 999 out of every 1,000 clergymen did wink with both their eyes, and were endeavouring to give as little offence as possible; but there was a minority of very unwise men who acted in a very different spirit. For instance, here was an extract from the *Church Times*; it was part of a speech made by a clergyman, who said that, "with the exception of a few men here and there, Dissenters were chiefly remarkable for ignorance, impudence, and stupidity"—(laughter)—and he also said that "the clergy were called on to bury the carrion of Dissent." He grieved to see such things. Better far to allow any number of Dissenters to read prayers in our churchyards than to expose the Church to the injuries that would result from such language. (Hear.) Lord Selborne, when Sir R. Palmer, had said that something must be done in this matter, and the six bills from the other side were a confession on their part that some remedy was necessary. If he wished to injure the Conservative party there was nothing he should like better than to allow this sore to fester for three or four years. The best course that hon. gentlemen opposite could take was to settle the question. He hoped that the Government, which for the last two years had managed the affairs of the country with great efficiency, which was so friendly to the Church, and which he believed was so sincerely desirous of reducing the grievances of the country, would find out some way of settling this miserable dispute. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. CROSS gave credit to the hon. member for Denbigh for having kept as far as possible to his declaration to avoid offending the sensibilities of any member on either side of the House; the hon. member had not duly appreciated what were the objections of Churchmen to this measure, nor had he understood what their feelings were and how deeply they held them. (Hear, hear.) The precedents for proceeding by resolution were generally at the commencement of debates, and not on subjects that had been debated, year after year, in the House of Commons, in the form of actual bills. But if this resolution was passed, how much nearer legislation would they be? If the hon. member found from circumstances over which he had no control that he could not get the second reading of a bill on an early day, he might have taken the discussion in July quite as well as now, and so have avoided the disadvantages of discussing an abstract resolution. What he wished, however, now to call attention to was that the resolution had been materially altered since it was first put on the paper some weeks ago.

Mr. O. MORGAN: I did that in deference to the wishes of some friends in Scotland.

Mr. CROSS said that strengthened the case he was presenting to the House, because it showed that the original resolution did not meet the wishes of the hon. member's friends, and that he had been obliged to throw over part of the menacing preamble. He would not enter into a legal discussion of what the hon. member called the "absolute right" of parishioners to be buried in the churchyard, but he would venture to point out that this "absolute right" of burial in churchyards was the same as the right of every parishioner to worship in the church, and if this resolution was ever passed, and then presented to the House, substituting the word "church" for "churchyard," it would be absolutely impossible for them consistently with their votes to receive the one and oppose the other. (Cheers) It was said that everybody must die and be buried, but that everybody need not go to church. They were not discussing whether a man was to be buried in the churchyard or not. It was the question of right they were discussing. Every man had a right to the services of the Church, only that by the same law he was bound to have them according to the rites which were there performed. (Hear, hear.) To what churchyards would the hon. member apply the right of the parishioners to be buried? Did he mean to confine it to the ancient parish churchyards which were scattered up and down throughout England; or did he mean to extend it to all churchyards open at the present time? If he meant the former, his resolution in the course of a few years would come to very little. If the latter, see to what conclusion he would drive them, for for they all knew that the number of parish churches in England had been multiplied enormously, he was thankful to say, especially of late years, not by rents, not by the State, not by gifts, except in a few instances, but by money voluntarily subscribed by members of that Church for the good of the community at large. Were the benefits thus given for the benefit of those with whom the giver worshipped to be torn away with rude hands? (Hear, hear.) The resolution went much further than that. It meant that for all time to come no member of the Church of England, whatever his wishes, however earnest and zealous he might be in the cause of religion, should be able to say that he could give for the good of those who worshipped with him a churchyard to be used according to the Church service. (Hear.) It would practically come to this, that members of the Church of England would be the only body within this realm who could not appropriate a churchyard to their own use. They might talk of liberty, they might talk of conscience, but he should call this the greatest tyranny that could be practised. (Cheers.) The parish churchyards, it was said, were by the law of England appropriated to the use of the entire body of the parishioners. But when a particular churchyard ceased to exist, what then. A case happened in the course of last year which forcibly illustrated this point. In the borough of Northampton all the churchyards had been closed, and there was no power to compel any of the parishes to provide burial places for any one who died there, the only place where any one could be buried being a private cemetery, and unconsecrated ground. If they wanted a grievance there was one. (Hear, hear.) If that cemetery were full to-morrow there would be no provision for burying. It might be asked how long had that great grievance been felt, how long that terrible state of tyranny and oppression under which Nonconformists were placed had existed? Let them look back some ten or fifteen years. What did they hear about that grievance at that time? Why, nothing. (Cheers.) Nonconformists in those days were not less zealous, less earnest, less enthusiastic than they are now. (Hear, hear.) Were they likely to overlook such an important matter if they had felt the grievance at that time? (Cheers.) Not only did they not then say that they had a grievance, but they did not even feel that they had one. There was much less in the way of grievance than there is now. Within the last twenty years the cemetery system had been greatly extended. In 1856 a return was laid on the table showing the sums of money borrowed for forming cemeteries, and the number of cemeteries that had been formed under the Burials Act. The number amounted to somewhere about 400. The hon. member said that only five or six cemeteries had been formed on the average in a year. The return on the subject had not been completed in time for that debate; but the returns made by the Local Government Board showed year by year how far the extension had gone, and it appeared that from 1856 to 1875 235 cemeteries had been formed, and in the course of the year 1875—6 there were no less than thirty-six fresh ones. If they looked further into the facts it was necessary to inquire for what population those cemeteries were available. The figures showed that as far as the cemeteries of England and Wales were concerned with a population of 22,000,000 there were about 14,000,000 for whom cemeteries had been provided. (Hear, hear.) He knew that cemeteries were provided principally in the neighbourhood of towns; but he was now arguing as to the grievance felt by the Nonconformist body, and he wanted to know how it had come to pass that before those cemeteries were formed they heard nothing from the Nonconformists, and that now that additional burying places had been provided for 14,000,000 persons the grievance was so much felt. (Cheers.) When the Bill was before the House, in 1873, the Prime Minister, quoting from returns furnished by the rural deans, stated that these were not public burial-grounds, but private burial-grounds, belonging to Nonconformists, which would provide accommodation for between one in four and one in five of the Nonconformists; that out of 6,200 parishes which had made returns, there were 1,627 which had not burial-grounds of their own; and that out of 6,828 parishes there were 2,231 Nonconformist burial-grounds. That showed that the

grievance had greatly diminished as compared with what it must have been twenty years ago. (Hear, hear.) There was another matter to be considered in discussing that question—that in those parishes where there were both cemeteries and churchyards, whilst the Nonconformists claimed to amount to about half the population of England and Wales, the burials in yards and consecrated ground were infinately more in numbers than those in unconsecrated ground, or in burial-places belonging to Nonconformists. Many of the Nonconformists not only did not object to have the Church service, but liked to have it—(cheers)—and as far as a great many of them were concerned, a great deal of what was said about the grievance was said for them, and very little was said by them. (Cheers) Much had been said about the action of the House and the Nonconformist body on the question of Church rates. The Nonconformists had the less reason to complain because they entirely refused to help to maintain the churchyards. (Hear, hear.) That, however, was an *ad hominem* argument, and he had no wish to urge it. What he contended was that at the time when they were discussing the question of Church rates the grievance they were now considering was never talked about. (Cheers.) A great deal had been said about what was done in other countries. They must take every country by itself, and recollect what was the history of this country, and how they had encouraged the population, and especially the Church part of it, to contribute towards the building of churches and the providing of churchyards. They could not deal with this country as if it were a new or a foreign country, because the old associations which had gathered around churches and churchyards were deeply seated in the minds of the people. (Cheers.) With respect to Scotland, so far from that country supplying a precedent in favour of the hon. and learned member, it was a precedent against him. What had happened in that country? There was there a common-law obligation that burial grounds should be provided, which was not the case here, and in Scotland the burial grounds were vested in the heritors, and had always been free from ecclesiastical dominion. Consequently, burial in that country had always been looked upon more as a civil act than as a religious rite. The practice there had been for a service not to be read, but in England it had been the practice to read a service. The habit in Scotland had been to allow anyone to read a service who wished to do so, and hence Episcopalians had read it. The case of Ireland having been referred to, he wished to show that it did not apply to the question in the way it had been supposed to do. In 1824 an Irish Act was passed which enabled clergymen to grant permission to persons to bury the dead as they liked; but that Act had afterwards to be repealed. The case of Ireland depended on a very different state of things from that of England. What had happened in Ireland? There were a great number of ministers who, knowing that the Irish people had deep religious feelings, were in the habit of performing burials in a manner which was contrary to law. They had been in the habit of burying their dead from time immemorial in Protestant churchyards. When the practice was found to be illegal, Mr. Plunkett introduced a bill, the object of which was not to create an innovation in the law of Ireland, but to legalise that which had always been done; but the legislation now proposed was legislation for the purpose of subverting that which had always been done—(cheers)—and so far from Ireland furnishing a precedent in favour of the hon. and learned member, it supplied one against him. They must consider the consciences, not simply of the clergy but of laymen in reference to that matter. (Hear, hear.) If Nonconformists said, "It can make no difference to you whether we bury with your service or not," he wanted the hon. and learned member to show that the Nonconformist body would say to Churchmen, "We don't care whether you come to our burial places or not; we are willing that you should come there; you cannot do it as a matter of right, but you may do so as a matter of convenience and charity." That was a question which, so far as he knew, had only been considered by one body of Nonconformists in England. The right hon. member for Birmingham, when the matter was last before the House, made a very interesting and eloquent speech. (Cheers.) The right hon. gentleman was a member of a body of Christians for whom he (Mr. Cross) felt very great respect. That body might be looked upon as a kind of symbol of persons who wished to be charitable in every direction. They had discussed that question not once only, but twice, and had adopted a resolution that persons not belonging to their sect might bury in their burial grounds. They said that the burial of persons who were not members of their religious sect might take place in their burial places, but they added, "Provided they are in all respects conducted as the burials of the Friends are conducted." (Ministerial cheers.) He claimed on behalf of the Church of England precisely the same right and liberty as the Quakers did. He was not speaking of the ancient parish churchyards alone, but of those which had grown up all over England through voluntary gifts. (Hear, hear.) The resolution said that it was just and right to permit interments with burial services other than those of the Church of England to be performed by persons other than the ministers of that Church. To whom did that apply? How far would it go? They were not touching there merely the Nonconformists, but were breaking down the whole discipline of the Establishment—(Hear, hear)—and by a side wind breaking down the parochial system; for they were saying, in the teeth of the canon law and of the Act of Uniformity, not simply that a service in a churchyard might be read by Nonconformists, but that it might be used over members of the Church of England by a minister of another body, and even by a layman. (Hear, hear.) That was a most extravagant proposition to put forward. But the resolution went too far in another direction. He was not going to bring before the House the conduct of the Jumpers and other sects of that kind; but it could not be denied that England had become the great emporium of the world, and that they had now congregated together a vast number of people of all nations and all religions, and they would be opening a wide door for innovation if they did what they were asked to do. He admitted that they must provide burial-grounds for such persons, but hon. members opposite were now seeking to interfere with churchyards. He grieved to say that there were a great number of persons who had no religion—persons who scoffed at religion, and who believed that this world was all, and that there was no world to come. These persons were not a small and insignificant body, and they took care to make their sentiments known. He held in his hand a book three-fourths of which were written expressly for the use of such persons, and at the end of it there were services for naming infants, marriage, and burial, containing such doctrines as he was quite sure the hon. and learned member who had introduced that question would be one of the last persons to wish to have read in any churchyard or Nonconformist burial-ground. (Cheers.) He would now go a little further into the wording of the resolution. They were asked to permit interments in the churchyards either without any Burial Service or with a Burial Service other than that of the Church of England, to be performed by persons other than ministers of that Church. The resolution pledged the House to nothing. If it passed they would have the same question as before—whether the burials they were going to permit were to be without a service or with one. The hon. and learned member had spoken of burials without a service as being buried like a dog. (Mr. O. Morgan: Not to-day.) That makes no difference. The hon. member did say so on a former occasion. (Mr. O. Morgan assented.) He had no wish to see that practice in this country, but he must say it was paying a poor compliment to Scotch members to describe the burials of Presbyterians in that way, and, at all events, when the hon. member for West Kent brought forward that question in 1875, the hon. and learned member in moving that the bill be read a second time that day six months, said he must be allowed to express his astonishment that any three members of that House should exhibit so little knowledge of the feelings of Dissenters or of human nature as to suppose that that canine mode of dealing with the matter could be a satisfactory settlement. Let him say in passing that those were somewhat disrespectful terms in which to speak of the great Presbyterian body in Scotland. Supposing the resolution were passed they would not have accomplished the remedy of what really was the disease. The real evil of the law of England was that there was no liability by the common law to provide burial-grounds. They passed that resolution; they inflicted upon an infinite number of persons a grievance which they would always feel, and twenty years hence they would have done next to nothing. They knew what had happened in the last twenty years, and they knew what would take place in the next twenty years. The population would go on increasing, and when the time came that they had to provide cemeteries for their teeming population, they would regret that they had not done so before they had stirred up the feelings which this resolution would stir up. The hon. member had chosen to refer to certain returns on the table of the House with regard to the churchyards which had been closed during the last twenty years. They were only issued that morning, and therefore he might be excused for not quoting the whole of them. The return divided them under the heads of closed, partially closed, and those that were open. With regard to the partially-closed churchyards, in certain churchyards there were certain vaults belonging to families. It could do no possible harm to anybody to allow after a certain number of years persons to be buried therein, and therefore the persons who had a right to be buried in those vaults ought not to be put to the trouble of an application to the Secretary of State to get their friends buried there. But in the vast majority of cases those parish grounds were practically closed, and therefore instead of having 660 closed in the country, and 180 closed in the district around London, they must add to the first return 1,045 partially closed in the country, and 45 partially closed in the district of London, so that they would get a total of both together of almost 2,000. Now these 2,000 churchyards had been closed since the passing of the Act of 1853, and he said that they would not only find since then a rapid increase of cemeteries in the first instance, but they would find a rapid decrease of churchyards in the second instance. He would ask the hon. members on that side of the House, who came from the country, to look at their own churchyards, and to talk to their sextons about them. Had they noticed the state they were in? Had they noticed the sexton burying the dead among the bones of the dead? Had they noticed churchyards placed where they had no right to be placed, in the midst of populous villages, and with wells for the use of the villagers on every side? In the last twenty years they had made a great advance in sanitary reform in this respect, and the more the matter was looked into the more necessary it would become to look into it. He had always regretted from the first that the burial-grounds of the country should not be under the supervision of inspectors attached to the Local Government Board instead of to the Home Office. The former had inspectors all over the country, and he should like to see the duties transferred. But when all that was settled he was quite certain of one thing, that what ought to be considered was how far they could clear away these miserable ecclesiastical disputes—(cheers and counter cheers)—and how they could, not for the past or for the present, but for the future, take care that the matter should be treated in an intelligent, broad, and statesmanlike spirit, that would provide not simply for the interment of the dead, but for the health and happiness of the living. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said that he had voted for Burial Bills for several years because it appeared that the small concessions asked for might be granted without inconvenient results. He had afterwards abstained from voting for two reasons—his intense dislike to religious battles in that House, and because he thought he saw indications of a desire to settle the question on fair grounds of compromise, if such could be found. Within the last year or two, however, the attitude of the opponents of any alteration in the present law had changed materially for the worse. He now heard it said that the Nonconformists had no grievance, and the resolutions agreed to at recent meetings of the clergy and laity breathed the spirit of no compromise and no surrender. In the pamphlet, in which he gave a negative answer to its title, "Shall we Surrender?" Canon Ryle, an Evangelical Churchman, said he was not ashamed to co-operate with Nonconformists, and believed that a converted Nonconformist would be saved; but yet he summoned Churchmen to fight the battle of the Church on this question in martial words which fell painfully upon his own ears as an English Churchman, for he could not bring himself to consider Dissenters as a hostile army against which he must do battle, but rather considered them as irregulars of the great religious army that was fighting against the vice of the age. It was too late in the day to deny the legal right of Dissenters as parishioners to interment in the churchyard, and the grievance was that the legal right was accompanied by conditions that diminished its legal value. In illustration of this he read a letter describing the interment of a gentleman, for fifty or sixty years a Baptist minister at Bristol, in the churchyard of the parish of Honiton, the funeral being attended by sons and sons-in-law, who were Baptist ministers, and by other representatives of the Baptist ministry and denomination, and the writer said that the compulsory reading of the Church Service did not, under the circumstances, afford that comfort to the mourners it might otherwise have done, and he asked clergymen of the Church of England to put themselves in a corresponding position, and imagine themselves submitting to a form of service prescribed by Baptists, and read by one of their ministers. This letter only illustrated the grievance that was felt by large numbers of Dissenters who from many considerations buried their dead in the parish churchyards. And the sentiments which led them to do so would not be respected by the provision of separate graveyards, which in many instances were unnecessary, because the churchyards were not full, or could easily be enlarged without detriment to the health of the living, so that it would be wasteful to put the ratepayers to expense for the single object of keeping Nonconformist ministers out of their churchyards. No one could object to a silent service when it was deliberately selected by preference, but that was a totally different thing from offering it as a substitute for a form of service which was desired. (Hear, hear.) To force the service of the Church of England upon any was not only hard upon them, but it degraded the service itself. The allowing of silent service would be the minimum of concession, but it was equivalent to saying that at a time of grief and sadness "Religion shall be dumb unless you are prepared to be religious according to our fashion." This was not the way to strengthen the hold of the Church upon the affections of the people. Believing it right to give an affirmative answer to the question which was raised in this bill, he was not to be deterred from giving it because hereafter he might be asked to do something which might be wrong. Canon Ryle said that if this bill contained a clause recognising the rights and privileges which clergymen had exercised for three centuries, he might think differently of it. Whence did the clergy derive their dignity of position and the respect with which they were so generally regarded? Not from any sacerdotal character which they might suppose belonged to them, not from their having a freehold in their churchyards. No; but their influence sprang from the hard, laborious work they were doing among the people; and neither their dignity nor influence would be endangered by any concession to the Nonconformists such as that proposed by his hon. and learned friend. (Hear, hear.) In what position would they be placing the clergy if they refused what was now proposed in the name of Christian charity? That concession was recommended by a large portion of the laity, and by no inconsiderable number of the clergy themselves, and if it were

refused on the ground that it would interfere with the dignity and status of the clergy, they would be placing a powerful weapon in the hands of their worst enemies. Then it was said that it would be subversive of the principle of a National Church to pass this resolution. If a measure intended to promote equality among British Christians and prevent irritation where nothing but charity should prevail, would be subversive of the principle of an Established Church, he asked, would they not, by refusing it, be aiding the advocates of disestablishment? He had never been an advocate for disestablishment, and he feared it much more in the interest of the State than of the Church. But disestablishment would not come one day the sooner if they made this concession. Let them say to Nonconformists—"Bring your dead under the shadow of our old church walls; let the ministers of your religious denominations speak the words of peace and comfort to the mourners of their flock as our clergy speak to us; and when the body of the dead man is committed to the grave, let us forget whether he was a Nonconformist, and remember only that he was an English Christian." (Hear.) He believed such a course would increase rather than lessen the authority of the Church. This question could only be settled ultimately in this way. It was steadily growing in the public opinion and must come to the front. The right hon. gentleman might possibly be able to lead into the lobby a majority against this resolution, but he knew full well that majority would avail nothing. He believed the carrying of this resolution would expedite the settlement of the question; but, whether its settlement was brought about by the right hon. gentleman or anyone else, he was confident that settlement could not be long delayed, and its only possible solution would be found in the principles involved in this resolution, for it was equally based in truth, in justice, in love and charity. He should, therefore, give it his cordial support. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. CUNLIFFE BROOKS spoke against the resolution, maintaining that the only right was a right to burial according to the usages of the Church.

Mr. ALLEN, speaking as a Wesleyan Methodist—a body who felt no hostility to the Church of England, and many of whom were Conservatives and in favour of the union of Church and State—was bound to say that there was an almost unanimous feeling among them in favour of the present motion. When a great body like the Wesleyans, mainly consisting of men of moderate views, and numbering 354,000 members, with about a million hearers in their chapels in this country, asked for the settlement of that question, he thought their wishes ought to be received by the House with respect. The boon they sought was a very small one—simply that their dead might be buried in the churchyards of their country, where the bodies of ancestors had lain for generations, with their own simple rites conducted by their own ministers. The Church of England had scarcely ever been so strong as she was at present, and it was the part of the strong to be just and generous.

Mr. GRANTHAM maintained that nowhere in history was any authority to be found for severing churchyards from the church, and that therefore the principle laid down in the resolution was unreasonable.

Mr. WALTER thought the hon. and learned member for Denbighshire was to be congratulated on the happy accident—if the expression might be used—which had obliged him to substitute his present resolution for the old Burials Bill with which they had been acquainted for so many years. The resolution seemed to him to raise the question in a more convenient form, asserting as it did a broad principle, which if it did not solve the whole difficulty of the case, at all events laid a foundation for its future and final settlement. He did not think the speech of the Home Secretary to be at all a convincing reply to the main proposition involved in the resolution before the House. (Hear, hear.) He would not indulge in any antiquarian digressions. To enter into the history of grievances was at all times an unprofitable task. It appeared to him to be a much more practical matter to consider whether they had any real existence in fact and reason, and whether they were such as under existing circumstances ought to be entertained. When they found the clergy in diocesan conference and in convocation were taking up the question and discussing the necessity of providing public cemeteries, they might conclude they had advanced a stage towards the solution of the question. (Hear, hear.) His belief was that the question, fairly examined, resolved itself into this — namely, inasmuch as cemeteries were by universal consent an impending necessity, an arrangement which must sooner or later be made — whether during an interval of twenty, fifty, or it might be a hundred years — the churchyards (and in that term he included not only the old parish churchyards, but the churchyards of modern churches, should be declared to be cemeteries for all public purposes. (Cheers.) That was, he believed, the real point, and the whole question they had to decide by their vote. His answer to that question would be distinctly in the affirmative. (Hear, hear.) He looked upon interment as a civil right which necessarily belongs to every human being. The policy of State required that there should be public place of interment common to the parishioners, and that right being once granted it seemed to him to follow as a matter of natural justice that the burials should be attended with such services as might be in accordance with the wishes and feelings which had been entertained by the deceased, or with no service if that were the wish. (Hear, hear.) The more he had considered this question, the more he believed that any restrictions upon the mode of interment or upon the service connected with it, except such as were considered necessary by the State for the preservation of public order and decency and the observance of sanitary conditions, were unreasonable in themselves and impossible to defend by argument. (Cheers.) Of course he was bound to go to the full extent of that argument. He had thought at times that there might have been a compromise, and he believed a large section of the House was willing to see a compromise effected; and, for all he knew, Dissenters themselves were willing to see the question compromised, by having the service conducted by a minister, the reading of passages of Scripture, and hymns. They heard a great deal spoken of the hardship that would be inflicted upon the feelings of the clergy and the feelings of the laity by allowing and tolerating other services than those of the Church of England in consecrated churchyards; but the more he considered this the more it vanished into thin air—into words. (Hear, hear.) How his feelings should be hurt, even in the case of a churchyard which he had given to the Church for the burial of Church people, by the burial of some other person in that churchyard, he really found it impossible to say. He could not reduce it to substance. This he would admit, that no possible hardship that could be felt by the clergy or imagined by them as growing from the permission of other services than those of the Church of England in the churchyards could for a moment be compared with the hardship of their present position in performing the service over those for whom it was not suited. (Hear, hear.) He believed this was a hardship which clergymen of tender consciences felt very deeply. With regard to the consecration of the churchyard, he had never been able to make out what virtue consecration imparted to the soil beyond that of separation for certain purposes. (Hear, hear.) The consecration of a churchyard set it apart for the purpose of burial, but what virtue it communicated to the soil so as to render it fit only for the burial of Church people with the service of their Church, and not fit for Dissenters with their service, he was not able to understand. What must be the case of the unfortunate people who die at sea? Take the case of a line-of-battle ship in which 100 sailors were killed. There might be men of all denominations —Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, &c., among the dead, but they were not thrown into the sea without service. The chaplain would read the service over the bodies of the Episcopalians; but if a Dissenter asked to be allowed to say a prayer over a comrade, a request so natural and reasonable would not be refused. What loss such persons could sustain because the sea had not undergone the ceremony of consecration he was totally at a loss to understand. (Cheers.) The whole case appeared to him to lie within the smallest possible compass. He had made up his own mind that the only way to treat this question was to recognise the churchyard as the burial place of the parish in default of a cemetery. (Hear, hear.) He, for one, would not vote for the compulsory extension of the churchyard; but supposing a churchyard, as many of them were, crammed full of corpses, utterly unfit to be used, in a shocking, neglected, and, he might almost say, disgusting state, savouring little of the odour of sanctity or consecration, he would not permit it to be extended, but in such cases he would have compulsory powers given to the parish to take grounds for a cemetery; and, in the meantime, in the absence of such a place, he would have the churchyard declared to be the burial place of the parish and used for that purpose. (Hear, hear.) If the clergy could only be got to look at the question from that point of view —and he knew many of them looked at it in that light, for he had discussed it with them at diocesan meetings—they would take a much more simple and natural view of the case. He had considered the question merely from a general and abstract point of view, but he might say it was not merely a Dissenter's grievance. He thought Churchmen had a grievance, too. By the law, as it stood, a child of a Churchman, equally with a Dissenter, if it died unbaptized, could not be permitted to have any funeral rites performed over it. If he had the misfortune to lose a child which was unbaptized, he should consider it a great hardship —something unnatural and hurtful to his feelings —that he should not be allowed himself, with the friends who accompanied him, to say a few words of prayer coming into his mind suitable to the occasion, and he should wish such a state of things to be remedied. It was his intention to follow his hon. and learned friend to a division, hoping, whether the resolution were carried or not, that the subject would receive general attention through out the country, and by this means lay the basis of some solid legislation. (Cheers.)

Mr. S. SACKVILLE opposed the motion, He contended that the position of the Nonconformists in this matter was utterly untenable since the abolition of Church rates.

Sir ROBERT ANSTRUTHER was glad Scotland had been referred to, for the argument from the practice in that country was entirely in favour of the motion, and that portion of the Home Secretary's speech told against his own point. No doubt, as he very fairly said, both by the ancient Scottish law, and by the more modern Scotch statute, the control of the churchyards in Scotland was entirely removed from the ecclesiastical dominion. (Cheers.) He would ask those who had cheered that remark whether, by any possibility, there could be any connection between the fact that the control of burial yards of Scotland, was taken from the ecclesiastical dominion, and the fact that the conduct of burials in these churchyards was entirely free from the vexatious restrictions which they found imposed upon churchyards in England? (Cheers.) The case was very much stronger than the Home Secretary had put it; not only was there entire freedom of service in churchyards in Scotland to every parishioner, but by an ancient decision given by an eminent Scottish judge, every inhabitant of a parish in Scotland had a right to be buried in the parochial churchyard. (Cheers.) It was claimed that there ought to be safeguards, as indeed there had been in former bills. Well, how did the case in Scotland stand? Every parishioner and inhabitant, by the Act of 1855, had a right to be buried in the parochial churchyard. There was no restriction applied, or desired to be applied, to the performance of the burial services in these churchyards by the Church of Scotland, and there was no section of Scotchmen who would more keenly oppose any attempt to sever the tie that bound Dissenters or Seceders to the Church by the means proposed by the hon. member for West Kent (Mr. Talbot) than the members of the Established Church of Scotland. (Cheers.) All services were allowed in the churchyards of Scotland, and although the Home Secretary seemed to make light of it, he respectfully submitted that having regard to their ancient prejudices in Scotland, which he was happy to say they had very much outgrown, it was not a thing to be treated lightly by the House that the services of the Roman Catholic communion and of the Episcopal Church were conducted in the parish churchyards of Scotland in full canonicals, and that there never had been, and he believed there never would be, the slightest objection made after on the part of the members of the Church of Scotland, or by any other person in that country. Then as to the entire absence of safeguards, only a few months ago, he was in communication with a distinguished Scotch divine. He asked him if there had ever been any difference in consequence of the entire freedom of the service read over the bodies in the churchyards, and he replied in words somewhat to this effect—"I believe you may search the records of all the Presbyteries of the Church of Scotland, from the days of John Knox down to the present day, and I don't believe one single case of impropriety over a grave or at a funeral can be found." (Cheers.) But were not hon. gentlemen on the other side traducing their own kith and kin? Were they not casting a reflection upon their own countrymen? Was it that Scotchmen were so infinitely superior in common-sense to Englishmen? Cheers.) He accepted the compliment paid to his country (Laughter.) He would rather think, however, that England was to some extent on a par with Scotland. (Renewed laughter.) If any hon. gentleman thought not, don't let them say that he run down his countrymen, for the reflection had been cast by their own countrymen. There was not a single word in any statute, law, or provision with reference to burials in Scotland which had reference to safeguards? (Hear, hear.) He admitted that there was some power of control over burials, but he affirmed that for 300 years that power had not been used. Then there could not be such a difference between the state of things on one side of the Tweed and on the other, that that which had been enjoyed for 300 years by every sort of Dissenter on one side could not be enjoyed on the other. As to the argument of the Home Secretary, founded on the voluntary contributions of members of the Church of England for churches and churchyards, he would remark that similar contributions had been made for a similar purpose by members of the Church of Scotland, and that Church would scorn to make it a ground for refusing to allow Dissenters to bury their dead in its burial-places. (Cheers.) He was a Churchman, and wished to see the Church of England maintain her influence and exercise her hold on the confidence and affections of the people of the country; but, in his opinion, the action of some of the dignitaries, and some of the clergy, and many of the laity of that Church, was doing much to sap the foundations of the Establishment —had done more to sap those foundations than all the proceedings of the Liberation Society during the past five years. (Cheers.) If they were to have a national church it must be a comprehensive church; and if the hon. member on the other side (Mr. Orr Ewing) desired to see the Church of England maintained in a national position, he must save her from the action of those who would induce her to pursue a course of narrow-minded bigotry. (Cheers.) If his hon. friend (Mr. Orr Ewing) voted with the Government on this question, he would feel very uncomfortable all the time he was in the lobby, and would be still more uncomfortable when he presented himself before his constituents to give an account of his stewardship. (Oh, oh.) He should be very much surprised, when

they came to see the division list next morning, if they did not find that many Scotch members on the Ministerial side found it convenient to go to bed early that night. (Laughter.) In the interest of plain truth and honesty he wished to see this question settled, and he hoped it was not too much to expect the Prime Minister to settle it, although he did say a few days ago that he would give the resolution his most staunch and uncompromising resistance. ("Hear, hear," from several members on the Ministerial side of the House.) Hon. gentlemen opposite should take care not to cheer that too much, because there was no saying what the Prime Minister might do—(laughter)—and he for one hoped that the right hon. gentleman, looking solely to the interest of the nation, would make up his mind to deal with that question in a comprehensive spirit. (Cheers.)

Mr. J. TALBOT also desired a settlement of this question, but he did so from a different point of view from the hon. baronet. The hon. baronet had taken a great deal of credit for the peaceful way in which burials had been conducted in Scotland during the last 200 years; but the explanation was simply this, that in Scotland there was no burial service at all.

Sir R. ANSTRUTHER requested permission to make an explanation, as this was a subject on which they felt keenly in Scotland. The fact was that while there was not usually any burial service at the grave, it was almost the universal custom to have religious services in the private houses.

Mr. J. TALBOT said that was the very point he was desirous of bringing out. The fact was that the only service performed at the grave was that of the Episcopalian Church in Scotland, which was the same as that of the Church of England. Now, they all knew what that was; but in England there was no saying what service they might not have performed. No one desired a settlement of the question more ardently than he did; but he wished it to be settled in a different way from that now proposed. He had placed on the notice paper an amendment which the forms of the House precluded him from moving, and had introduced a bill to provide greater facilities for establishing burial-grounds, and he regretted that the resolution had deprived him of all chance of a discussion on the bill that evening, it being on the paper. He asked the House to consider who were calling for the change in the law now under discussion. On the 15th of February there was a meeting at the Westminster Palace Hotel, which was presided over by the hon. member for Merthyr Tydvil. The hon. gentleman informed his hearers that, while attending to a pressing question like the Burials Bill, they must not forget the greater controversy with Church Establishment in any form, which, like the poison tree of Java, blasted everything which it overshadowed. In the face of statements like this it was not easy to preserve a perfectly calm tone and attitude. With reference to the case of Scotland it was true that services were not usually conducted at the grave, but if the principle laid down by the hon. and learned gentleman were adopted in England, they would have read in English churchyards the services of every religious sect, and possibly of sections of the community who had no religious belief at all. He desired, therefore, to avoid the possibility of scandal and to provide safeguards for the observance of the sanctity of our churchyards. In Ireland as in Scotland the religious denominations agreed not to differ at the grave. His Grace the Archbishop of Armagh, in a recent letter, referring to the state of things in Ireland, wrote that it had not been the habit of Roman Catholics and Presbyterians to have any religious services at the graves. His grace went on to say that the religious services were held at the house of the deceased but not at the burial-ground—(No, no)—and he added that the Acts of 1824 and 1868 had not been of the slightest use—that, on the contrary, they had stirred up strife and been the occasion of parochial quarrels. Now, with respect to the case of foreign countries, the instances recited by the correspondents of the Archbishop of Canterbury did not, he thought, advance the case in favour of the resolution. In France, those who did not belong to a particular community could not be buried in consecrated ground; in Germany, the right of every member of a religious community to be buried in a cemetery existed, but the burial-ground was under the control of a local board; and Austria was very liberal, because there not only prayers but preaching was allowed; but the Minister of Public Instruction added, "The practical working of this law requires the greatest tact." In conclusion, he would only say that he had by the proposition he had submitted, not taken up the *non possumus* view of the question. There was a principle in the case, and to that principle they must unflinchingly adhere—and that was that they could not admit into the churchyards of this country the ministrations of a minister who did not belong to the Church of England, because they believed, and justly believed, that if they did, on the same principle they could not refuse him admission to the church itself. He admitted that there might exist a small grievance on the part of a few Nonconformists, and if by facilitating the establishment of public graveyards that grievance could be removed he would be the first to hail the fact with pleasure. It was no pleasure to him to see perpetuated after death the miserable differences which had divided them in life. The Church of England was ready to open her arms wide to every member of the community who was baptized and whose relations would bring their remains to the churchyard, but on the conditions now suggested they could not admit alien ministers or alien services. (Hear, hear.)

Sir W. HARCOURT, who was received with Liberal cheers, said there was one point which had been challenged by the hon. member who had just sat down, and by the Home Secretary, who asked whether in this case there was any substantial grievance. He desired to meet that argument, because in a practical assembly like that it was the one which would carry the greatest weight. They would desire to consider whether there was any class of their fellow-subjects—of those whom it was their duty, on whatever side of the House they sat, to represent—that had a just and legitimate grievance. To test the point he would read a letter from one of his constituents, which in its pathos and the self-control it exhibited under very severe provocation would commend itself to the House. The hon. and learned gentleman then read the letter, which was from a Baptist not by birth but by conviction. Four months after residing in Oxford he had lost two children, who, not being christened, had to be buried without service at the grave, he holding a service first at his own chapel. Since then he had lost four others, and the same course had been pursued. On the 20th of last month his wife died, and he ordered a brick grave for her, but, owing to the expense, 9*l.* 10*s.*, of which 4*l.* would go into the vicar's pocket, he decided to have an ordinary grave, and informed the sexton that he should require no service. On arriving at the cemetery they were met by the curate, who insisted on performing the service under the vicar's order, and eventually, under strong protest, the writer assented. In the name of our common humanity, the hon. and learned member continued, such scenes of grief should no longer afford the opportunity for the display of religious intolerance. He did not know with what feelings hon. members on the other side had heard that sad story. All he could say was that, as a faithful and devoted member of the Church of England, he had read it with grief, with shame, and with indignation. (Hear, hear.) What was the use, in the face of such histories as that, telling Nonconformists they had no substantial grievance? (Hear, hear.) Was there any man among them, on whichever side he might sit, who, had he been subject to such treatment as that, would not carry with him an abiding sense of bitter resentment? He doubted if there were many present who would have the self-control to be able to act so moderately. (Hear, hear.) There were few who had not listened to the sacred and solemn service of the Church of England on the burial of the dead without feeling the consolation which that service brought to mourners in the hour of sorrow and distress. What, however, was to be thought of those who perverted that service of consolation by forcing it upon unwilling ears, and in order to assert a priestly supremacy under circumstances which converted it into a desecration of religion itself? They had all read with disgust the conduct of those who had kidnapped a Jewish boy in order that he might be baptized into the Christian faith, and how was it different when a clergyman seized the cold and senseless clay of one who, when alive, did not desire the services of the Church of England? He was told that this was the law; but what a law! and how long would it be allowed to continue? The hon. member (Mr. Talbot) was surprised at this grievance about silent interment. The Nonconformists desired to have a service in their own chapels, if they were not to be allowed to have a suitable service over the grave, and if the latter were denied them they did not want to have a service which they did not approve, performed by force over the corpse. When that course was taken against the wishes of the living, he declared that the service which members of the Church of England heard with so much solemn respect, instead of being a religious ceremony, was nothing but a superstitious incantation. (Cheers.) Hon. members opposite called this a sentimental grievance. Yes, it was a sentimental grievance, because it appealed to a sentiment that lay deepest and truest in the nature of man, and it was for this reason that a grievance of this kind was the more real and intolerable. It was said that this was done on principle, and the case of Ireland had been referred to. Right hon. gentlemen opposite were not, however, in a situation to affirm that they oppose this resolution on the ground of principle. When the Home Secretary alluded to Ireland he would remind him that the Established Church of Ireland was under the operation of the Act of Uniformity. The law was the same in both countries, and to talk of a distinction between England and Ireland was entirely incorrect.

Mr. CROSS: I said the practice was different.

Sir W. HARCOURT said that he was talking about the law. At a time when a spirit of bigotry was rampant, Mr. Plunket came forward in 1824, and succeeded without opposition in inducing the House of Commons to declare that the dead of all persuasions in Ireland should be buried in the churchyard of the National Church, and that they should be interred with their own religious rites, subject to the approval of the clergyman of the parish. What was the next stage? In 1868, when the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) was at the head of the Government, a bill was introduced by Mr. Monsell, then a member of that House, upon the allegation that the veto of the Irish clergymen was sometimes improperly used—to take away that veto. What was the principle of that bill?

Whenever any person who, at the time of his or her death, shall not have been a member of or in communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, shall be buried as of right [the very words of the resolution] within the churchyard or graveyard, it shall be lawful for the priest or minister of that religious denomination to which such person belonged to attend such burial, and to read such prayers or perform such burial service at the grave as is usual and customary at the burial of persons belonging to such religious denomination, and any person wilfully obstructing such prayer or burial service shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanour.

(Cheers.) Now, that was a declaration that any person of a different persuasion from the Church of England should, nevertheless, be buried with the ceremonies usual among his own persuasion, and that any one obstructing such interment, even if it were the clergyman of the parish himself, should be held to be guilty of a misdemeanour. (Hear, hear.) What was the period at which that bill was introduced by Mr. Monsell? The question of the disestablishment of the Irish Church had been raised, and it was the interest and business of the party opposite to defend every outwork of the Established Church. Yet Lord Naas, the Irish Secretary of the Government, said he was favourable to the principle of that bill, and it passed through the House of Commons with the assent of the Government. The bill then went up to the House of Lords, and as the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government was in a majority in that House he might have put a negative upon it. But what was done? The Primate of Ireland moved that the bill be referred to a select committee; but a member of the Government, Lord Malmesbury, begged the most rev. prelate to withdraw his motion, because it would appear to be intended to shelve the bill. He was, therefore, entitled to say that this measure was passed with the assent and assistance of right hon. gentlemen opposite, and how they could say that they were opposed to this bill on principle he could not understand. (Hear, hear.) They had always contended that the status and principles of the Irish Church were the same as those of the English Church, and if they thought it consistent with their duty to throw open the churchyards of Ireland, he could not see how they could defend their opposition to this resolution on the ground of principle. (Hear.) If, however, the ground of principle was not to be maintained, what was to be the policy of the Treasury Bench? He had listened to the speech of the Home Secretary, and with the exception of some vague suggestions of a universal new rate to establish new churchyards in the country—it was not very clear whether they were wanted or not—he could not understand what he proposed to do. It was no doubt a very adroit and very able speech—(cheers)—and he criticised the resolution of the hon. member for Denbighshire. The right hon. gentleman was, however, mistaken if he thought that this question was going to be settled by verbal criticism. (Cheers.) The public outside would expect that Parliament would deal with the substance of the matter. One of the right hon. gentleman's criticisms was, however, unfounded. He said that it was contrary to Parliamentary rule to deal with a question by resolution when it had been the subject of a bill. His hon. and learned friend might, however, refer to the great example of Catholic Emancipation. When year after year a bill had been brought in and defeated, Sir F. Burdett took the course followed by his hon. and learned friend, and, relinquishing the procedure by a bill, brought in a resolution. It was, perhaps, a good omen that that change of policy in proceeding by bill instead of resolution was adopted the year before the Catholic claims were conceded. The Home Secretary asked what we were going to do 20 years hence, when the graveyards would be fuller than now. He did not feel disposed to enter upon a discussion of that question; he was sure this difficulty would have been settled long before that time. As to the duty of parishes to provide graveyards, it might be an interesting question, but he did not see what it had to do with the matter under discussion. The question for solution now was, What will you do for Nonconformists in the graveyards that exist? It was not a question with reference to graveyards we did not possess, and which might or might not be provided. What was the policy of the Government? Were they going to raise the flag of "No surrender?" If they listened to the hon. member for Kent they would do so. He said,—"I was willing to be liberal and tolerant and to make terms with Nonconformists when in a minority, but now I am in power I will listen to nothing of the kind." They wanted to know from persons of more authority if this was the policy of the leaders of the Conservative party. Did they wish to tell the Nonconformists, "Whatever may have been our language, spirit, policy in those days when we were in opposition, now we are in power we will give you no terms and no compromise whatever?" They wished to learn whether this was the language and policy of the Conservative Government. He was not alarmed by the language of "No surrender." He had observed that the language of "No surrender" was always most loudly used on the eve of capitulation. (Hear, hear.) In spite of what had been said by the hon. member for Kent, he knew there

was sitting upon the Treasury Bench a sagacious and prescient statesman who at that moment was only revolving in his mind schemes of escape from a situation which he knew to be untenable. The right hon. gentleman had been exposed to singular treatment of late. They had been accustomed to see the right hon. gentleman educated by his party, but a certain section of his party in the course of last week seemed to have undertaken the rather difficult task of educating him. (Laughter.) The principal pedagogues on that occasion were the Chairman of Ways and Means and the hon. member for the City of London; they went to lecture him upon this question and to tell him what he must do. He doubted whether this was a game in which they would succeed. They might have a very docile pupil for the moment, but in the long run it would be they who would have to learn the last lesson upon this subject. The education of such distinguished scholars was difficult, and lessons were long and tedious in an education of this character. We had seen before, and we might see again, instances of instantaneous and miraculous conversion. But, whether the process was long or short, for his part he believed the result was certain. This question would run the same course many questions had run before. We had heard exactly the same language on the subject of Catholic Emancipation, the Jews Bill, and the Corporation and the Test Act that we had now heard from the hon. member for Kent. It was now said we should have a Jewish funeral service in a parish churchyard, and it was formerly said we should have a Jew in Parliament. (Hear, hear.) Well, we had got a Jew, and Parliament was the better for it. It was said that if Church-rates were abolished the Church would be ruined; but it had not been, and all prophecies of that kind had been falsified by the result; and the hon. member for Newcastle-under-Lyme, speaking as a Wesleyan Methodist, had said that night that in his opinion the Church was stronger now than at any former period. Was the Church unanimous in its opposition to this proposal? Who was meant by the Church? If the clergy, he demurred altogether to the language used. He knew there were pretentious priests who arrogated to themselves to speak in the name of the Church; but the clergy were a section, and not the most important section, of the Church. The voice the House of Commons would look to was the voice of that congregation of which the clergy were only the ministers; and were the laity of the Church unanimous on this point? They were not. Even the clergy were divided, and had expressed different views at their meetings and in Convocation itself; and there were great and venerable leaders in the Church who took that view of this subject which the House was invited to take by the resolution. As to the argument that this proposal was a sidewind, an indirect attack upon Establishment and the connection of the Church with the State, if he thought it would have that result he would not support it. The most Disestablishmentarian argument he had heard for a long time was one used by the Home Secretary when he thought it worth his while to quote the practice of the Society of Friends as a rule for the National Church of England. If that argument was good for anything, it would dethrone the National Church from its condition as an Establishment, and reduce it to a sect. Was it really believed that all who were going to support the resolution desired the disestablishment of the Church of England? If those who were going into the lobby from that side of the House in support of the resolution were enemies of the Establishment, it was an ominous sign for the Church of England; but they knew it was nothing of the kind. It was true there were, inside and outside the House, those who would go further; but that had been equally true of the supporters of the other reforms he had named; and yet those measures were carried because they were supported by a great portion of the enlightened part of the community. He regretted to know that there were many Nonconformists to whom the principle of Establishment was absolutely unpalatable; he knew there was also a great body of Protestant Dissenters who would, if allowed, be friendly to the Church of England, and who did not desire to see her light extinguished. The people who would most regret the defeat of this resolution would not be the enemies of the Church of England; it was those who most desired to see a settlement of this question; itwas that sentiment which inspired the minority of the clergy to whom he had referred, which actuated men who, like himself, desired to deliver the Church from a danger which they believed to menace her. In 1873, in opposing this measure, the First Minister of the Crown used this language,—"What I want to see is the cessation of this war between the Nonconformist bodies and the Church of England." (Hear, hear.) That was a sentiment worthy of an English statesman; and he wished now to ask—Are you going to permit a cessation of this warfare? Are you going to defer the cessation of it by prolonging this exasperating controversy? What all the friends of the Establishment should most desire to do was to remove all those causes of offence, all invidious privileges which were not of the essence of the existence of an Establishment—that they should extend to those outside its pale a policy of charity, of conciliation, and of peace. How could they say that such a policy as they were now insisting on was of the essence of an Establishment? In Ireland it was not considered as of the essence of the Establishment. In Scotland it was not now so considered. What could be more unwise on the part of the friends of the Church than to identify that Church with a policy which enlisted against it the sentiments of humanity and the sympathies of mankind? For his part he would take no share in such a policy. It was as a friend of the Church of England that he declined altogether to link its living fortunes with dead and decaying privileges, for, if the two were inseparable, it was his firm belief that many a man would be reluctantly driven to the conclusion that the cause of that Church was one which neither could be nor ought to be defended. (Cheers.)

Mr. Raikes said as to the case quoted by his hon. and learned friend at Oxford, he should like to know if there was a public cemetery there. ("No," and cheers.) They were also not told whether the wife was baptized or not. She might have been a member of the Church of England. The cases of Ireland and Scotland were entirely different—in Ireland the Church was in a hopeless minority, while in England she was in a large, and, he believed, an increasing majority. The hon. member for Denbighshire had laid great stress on the case of "The Crown *v.* Taylor," but in that case there was a misconception of the status of the person whose burial was in dispute; no arguments were offered on behalf of the defence, no judgment was pronounced, and, therefore, he contended it was still an open question whether there was a common-law right of sepulture separate from the right to perform over the body the service of the Church of England. This resolution was not, as had been said, disestablishment in disguise, but rather a claim for concurrent endowment, as it demanded equal sacerdotal privileges. The vicar of a parish near Bradford had written to him to say that he lived at least two or three miles from any cemetery, that he had no burial-ground attached to his church, but that within a couple of hundred yards there was a Baptist chapel with an admirable cemetery attached, and that he could not bury there. (Hear, hear.) He was not blaming the Baptists, but he said that charity began at home. (Cheers.) The hon. gentleman also quoted an extract from the Rev. Stephen Gladstone to show that in his parish in North Wales Dissenters, as a rule, preferred Church burials, but that it was possible just a few would like the ceremony to be performed by their own minister—(Hear, hear)—but he added, "Till they apply to be rated in respect of such use of Church property, I do not see how they can consistently claim any right at all over the fabric of churchyard." (Cheers.) He was not one of those who had ever denied the existence of a grievance, but he believed that it affected, not the main body of the Nonconformists, but the Nonconformist ministers, who were jealous of the position of the clergy. And was that House to sacrifice the peace which ought to reign by the grave in order to gratify the envy or the jealousy of a small minority? (Cheers.)

Mr. Leatham remarked that there were some questions the public discussion of which was so calculated to throw light on other and broader questions with which they had some relation, that whenever his party was beaten on such questions in that House he confessed he had regarded their failure with a good deal of equanimity. He believed that no politician parted with a good grievance without pang, and if he were anxious to take a very narrow view of this controversy he should say to hon. gentlemen opposite to go on beating them year after year, for the oftener they did so the more thoroughly would they beat into the public mind the conviction that there was no real remedy for the group of grievances, of which this was one, short of disestablishment itself. (Cheers.) He could not help thinking that the speech of the Home Secretary did far more credit to his power as a debater than to his shrewdness as a practical man, or to his faculty as a logician. The right hon. gentleman told the House that the new churchyards were to be swept away from the Church, but if he had glanced his eye over the resolution he would have seen that the only churchyards to which it referred were the parochial churchyards, and therefore the new churchyards were not in question. (Hear, hear.) He threw out a distinct challenge to Dissenters to admit Churchmen to their burial grounds. If they asked a Mussulman to dinner they would not ask him to eat pork—(a laugh)—and Dissenters would not be disposed to insult Churchmen by offering them their burial-grounds, when they knew that no Churchman would be interred in unconsecrated ground. (Hear, hear.) It was said it was with an ill-grace that Dissenters made their present demand, considering that when a compromise was tendered to them during the discussions on Church-rates they refused to accept it or to pay for the maintenance of the churchyards. But surely when the use of a thing was coupled with conditions which deprived it of its value, what right had they to expect people to pay for it on those terms? Equality of payment presupposed equality of use, and he denied that Churchmen and Dissenters now used the churchyards on equal conditions. Everything was done that was congenial to the Churchman, whereas when the Dissenter went there for interment he was only buried to be put out of sight. Give the Dissenters equality of burial and enable them to bury their dead in the parish churchyard without contumely. But as long as they were only permitted to bury on sufferance, and their dead were taken from them at the churchyard gate, they resented the act as an indignity, and altogether declined to pay for it as a boon. The clergy especially ought to petition for the change now proposed, because many of them highly prized the Athanasian Creed, and read its damnatory clauses with emphasis and vigour on Sunday. On Monday they might be called upon to bury a Dissenter who was the unfortunate object of these maledictions, and to declare that they committed him to the grave in a sure and certain hope of a joyful resurrection. To his mind it was a great wrong that a Dissenter should be denied at his grave the services of his own particular minister, and that he should have to be buried in the parish churchyard amid surroundings against which he had all his lifetime protested. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Pell believed the present motion to be an invidious one, and one fraught with danger to the Church; and whatever they did hereafter—and he hoped something would be done with regard to this question—the party with whom he acted would vote in a way that would be perfectly well understood. (Derisive cheers.)

Mr. Watkin Williams wished to say, as a Churchman, that he was not influenced by the religious opinions which, it was said, operated on the minds of those who brought forward this resolution. He was influenced by the conviction that his Nonconformist friends suffered from injustice and oppression—("No, no," and cheers)—and he could not but regret that the clergy had allowed their golden opportunity to pass a few years ago, when they declined the compromise offered them, thus following the worst traditions of the Church. They seem to learn nothing, to forget nothing, and to give up nothing. Lord Stowell said that he did not know any positive rule of law which regulated the deposit of bodies in graves, and that the authority for the existing ceremony was to be found in our manners rather than our laws. If so, what became of the argument that the right of burial existed only along with the ceremony which attended it? The grievance now complained of was due to the change in the religious opinions of the nation, and the feeling of opposition aroused among the population with regard to the Church was due, in a great degree, to the alarming spread of sacerdotal claims on the part of the clergy—claims with which the laity had no sympathy, and which they were determined to check. The case of Scotland and Ireland had been cited to refute the suggestion that if this change were made, any indecency or irreverence would follow. (Hear, hear.) Russia, Germany, and Austria, had been referred to in the same way. It was very nearly true that England stood alone on this question, and it was humiliating to confess that the clergy of the Established and Reformed Church of England were setting an example of bigotry and intolerance to the rest of Europe. He hoped the representatives of the people would emancipate themselves from the influence of the clergy in this matter, and would resolve that the Church should not be open to the stigma mentioned by Spelman—"Oh, shame upon our religion that heathens and soldiers are more gracious to their dead enemies than ministers of the Christian religion are to their living brethren." (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Disraeli: I think the importance of the question before us, interesting though it may be, is somewhat exaggerated when we are told, as we have been told by the hon. and learned gentleman, that the heart of the people is touched upon this question, and when we have also heard in the course of the debate that it is a question with which the whole nation is deeply concerned. Now, though, as I have said, an interesting question, it does not appear to me to be one of general, certainly not of universal interest. We have been told continually in this debate that it does not concern Ireland. We have been told continually also that it does not concern Scotland. We are in possession of evidence that two-thirds of the population of 22,000,000 in England and Wales now have recourse to cemeteries. We have, therefore, to consider the effect of the existing regulations upon one-third of the population of England and Wales. I do not say this is not a very important element, one which demands serious and grave consideration, but we should have this fact in our minds when reminded so frequently that we are now discussing a question upon which the passion and thought of the whole nation are intent. (Hear, hear.) Let us analyse for a moment the position of these eight millions. I have heard it estimated, and it is, I believe, an estimate for which there is fair ground, that of these eight millions of people, 2,000,000 are Nonconformists, considerably, if not adequately, provided with cemeteries of their own. We have, then, to consider the population of 6,000,000 belonging to the Church, among whom are found all the churchyards which we are now discussing. I am not insensible to the associations of a churchyard. I am the member for Bucks, which possesses the churchyard the subject of the immortal Elegy to which reference has been made. It is impossible to read without motion the lines upon the place where "the rude forefathers of the hamlet sleep." But unfortunately the rude forefathers of the hamlet do not sleep in these tombs. Their slumbers have been disturbed, and since the day of Mr. Gray the condition of the churchyard is very much changed. The population of the country has immensely increased and the condition of the churchyards of England, accurately described by the hon. member (Mr. Pell) as highly unsatisfac-

tory—I would even say, in a great degree disgraceful. (Hear, hear.) Nor is there any adequate cemedy for this great evil. Those persons who have given much attention to the sanitary condition of the country know how inadequate are the means which the Government possess to cope with the evil, and unless it is encountered, how imperfect and unsatisfactory will be all the results expected with regard to the churchyards of the country. (Hear, hear.) The Secretary of State has under his charge the churchyards of England, and he has no machinery whatever to supervise their condition. If this great duty were transferred to the President of the Local Government Board, with an adequate staff under him, which possibly his office could command, very considerable results might no doubt be realised. And I must say that at this time, when we are entering into all these controversies, these competitive efforts to enjoy the churchyards of England—(laughter)—it would be much more desirable if we could take measures to make more decorous the home that awaits us, so that our posterity might at least recognise the duty we ought to fulfil towards them. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, if this be a state of the country, which is an unjust one, and I believe—though I touch somewhat slightly upon it at this hour—that it is perfectly justified by information in the possession of the Government, I am entirely opposed, on grounds different from those which have prevailed, generally speaking, in the course of this debate, to dealing with the churchyards in any other way than placing them in a condition favourable to public health, and shutting up all those the condition of which is quite hopeless. This is a subject intimately connected with the resolution of the hon. and learned gentleman. In what way can we put these churchyards in a proper condition? The hon. member for Fife scorned the idea that where a landlord gave a portion of his territory for the use of his parish and his neighbours, he should be allowed to make any conditions as to the religious tenets of those who may take advantage of his gifts. We know very well that in England the majority of the owners of land are members of the Church of England. (Hear, hear.) Well, we must deal with them as we find them, and if by legislation we attempt to induce the landlords of England to come liberally forward and assist us in making a considerable revolution and change in these churchyards, it is impossible not to feel that if we make it a condition that their use shall not be confined to those of their own religious belief we shall find in many, and probably in the majority of instances, a great want of zeal in their efforts to assist us. (Hear.) There is no doubt we should be forced for the sake of public health to close many churchyards among this population of 6,000,000. We may prevent a very expensive outlay in establishing cemeteries by inducing the landlords to come forward and assist us, but we cannot do this unless their munificence was applied to a certain extent to those of their own faith. They may be bigots and may hold unphilosophical tenets, but everybody must acknowledge that to a certain degree they will prevail, and that there is no hope of bringing forward any great measure to reform these remaining churchyards and to put the cemeteries in a permaneut sanitary condition unless we are assisted by the landlords of the country. (Hear.) Therefore, in that aspect, this is not a sectarian but a sanitary question. ("Hear," and laughter.) I admit, however, there is another aspect of the question, and to that I will now address myself. It is a sectarian question in one sense, and that is the very fault I find with the conduct of those who bring forward the motion and support it. This is part of not a secret but an avowed system promoted by a well-organised and able party in this kingdom to terminate the connection between Church and State. (Cheers.) I did not mean to say, and I do not mean to say, when speaking of that party, that I was speaking of the gentlemen sitting opposite—(laughter)—who honourably and conscientiously agree with those opinions; but I am talking of a very powerful party organised in this country, and represented also in this House, who now for a serious of years have not only avowed their intention, but have indicated the means and the measures by which that intention is to be accomplished; and among those means and measures is this very proposition of the hon. and learned member for Denbighshire. How innocent must you think us when you affect surprise because we feel alarmed by a measure which you yourselves describe as so cordial, so friendly, and so innocuous when it was at first devised, and is now ardently and industrously propagated and supported, by those who avow that their object is to accomplish a great political end which we believe would be destructive to the best interests of the country. (Loud cheers.) This is the reason we meet your proposal with such decided opposition. This is part of a scheme, one of the numerous tactics, a portion of a well-devised and matured strategy, which is to advance until at last it obtains possession of the citadel. The hon. and learned member for the City of Oxford stated that three years ago, and lamented the bitter controversies that still subsisted between Churchmen and Nonconformists. I lament them; I always have lamented them, believing as I do that the Church of England is one of the greatest securities for the welfare of the people, even for our liberties, as well as our moral happiness and general welfare. I have always done justice to the great deeds of Nonconformis'.s. I know how much in the history of this country we owe to the high moral qualities, the love of liberty, and the bold, heroic conduct of the Nonconformists of England, and therefore I much deplore the alienation between Churchmen and Nonconformists. I cannot see in the real nature of things why that hostility should exist; it exists only because there is a certain portion among the Nonconformists, modern in their thought, modern and novel in their conception of their public duty, who have taken, to my mind, a completely erroneous conception of the Constitution of this country and the possible results which they can obtain consistently with a due observance of that Constitution. We have come to a time when we have heard men speak with contempt of the toleration which was the great achievement of Nonconformists of old days, and who say that nothing will satisfy them but equality. (Opposition cheers.) Well, but that cheer from the other side proves exactly what I wish to have believed—that those who cheer are in favour of the schemes of the party out of doors to which I refer. Equality on this subject is, in fact, inconsistent with the Constitution of the country, and therefore I regret the controversy between Nonconformists and Churchmen It is because I believe they might live in harmony in the full and equal possession of civil and religious liberty—(Opposition cheers)—that I regret they are attempting to get what they call religious equality; which is, in fact, destroying the Constitution, right or wrong—whatever may be their opinion of the Constitution, and I don't want to enter into an argument now upon the English Constitution—I say the religious equality they desire is the subversion of the existing settlement of this country. That is the reason why I must give my opposition to this motion. It has been brought forward, as I have intimated, on a very frail plea, upon a subject which has really little to do with the momentous principles invoked in this debate. I believe if the sanitary condition of this country were what it ought to be—(Opposition laughter)—there would be no controversy now about churchyards. I trust the time is not far distant when that will be remedied; but when the hon. gentleman opposite comes forward with a motion which, if carried, pledges the House to principles subversive of the political as well as the religious settlement of this country—for you cannot accomplish the object you have in view consistently with maintaining the Constitution of this country—I must give, although I regret ever to give a vote which savours at all of religious exclusiveness or bigotry—(Opposition cheers)—I must take the question out of the ingenious and eloquent representations and misrepresentations we have listened to, and to a measure which I believe to be insidious and dangerous, I must give an uncompromising opposition. (Cheers.)

The Marquis of HARTINGTON: I know the House is anxious for a division, and I promise to detain it only for a short time. I do not think it necessary on this occasion to discuss the question of Disestablishment. My hon. and learned friend the member for Oxford reminded the House that the argument from disestablishment has been often before employed when some grievance felt by Dissenters has been brought forward. (Hear, hear.) That argument has been often before employed, but happily, it has been disregarded, and I should like to ask whether, in the opinion of the House, the Church is weaker in the estimation of the country than it was before? (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman, following the example of the Home Secretary, depreciated as much as he could the extent of the grievance. But, I think, both right hon. gentlemen utterly misunderstood what was the real nature of the grievance of which the Dissenters complain. It does not matter, in my opinion, whether this grievance extends, as was stated by the right hon. gentleman, to two millions of our fellow subjects or to a much lesser number. The grievance is not felt merely by those who are compelled under the existing law to bury their relations in churchyards with rites which they do not approve; the grievance is felt to be a grievance o' the whole Nonconformist body. (Hear, hear.) The Home Secretary made an ingenious speech, but to a great extent he avoided the question and did not meet the grievance complained of. The right hon. gentleman who has just sat down, when he before moved the rejection of the bill of the hon. member for Denbighshire, stated that he could not admit that the Nonconformists had even a minute grievance. The right hon. gentleman has not repeated that statement, nor did the Home Secretary to-night make it. They have both minimised to the utmost of their ability the number of persons to whom the grievance applies, but I have not heard either of them deny that a real grievance exists. If they do not deny the existence of the grievance, neither do they admit it, nor hold out the slightest hope that they will either by compromise or any other plan remove that grievance. (Hear.) It is quite clear what the Government are prepared to do. They are prepared to maintain, probably at the command of their clerical supporters—(Opposition cheers)—the vast extent of the privileges of the clergy of the Established Church, however much annoyance and dissatisfaction those privileges may cause to their Nonconformist fellow-countrymen. But they are prepared to treat this question as a sanitary question—(loud Opposition cheers)—and they indulge in what I believe will be a futile hope that by diminishing the number of churchyards in which this grievance will exist, and the number of persons directly effected by the grievance, they will get rid of the agitation which undoubtedly exists. The Home Secretary is prepared for a measure. He bewails the mistake that was made some years ago when the burials inspector was attached to the Home Office, and not to the office of the Local Government Board. (Laughter.) The right hon. gentleman is prepared to deal with this question by transferring that inspector from his own department to that of his colleague—(renewed laughter)—and I think he held out some hope that in another session he would be prepared to deal with the existing state of the law, and would bring forward some measure by which all churchyards which are not in a good sanitary condition should be closed. (Laughter.) But that treatment will not allay this agitation. You cannot upon sanitary grounds close all the churchyards in the country; and however active your burial inspectors may be, there will remain in many country parishes churchyards which you cannot find a sanitary reason for closing. (Hear.) A good deal has been said about the fast-increasing population of the country. But the House must recollect that this question does not apply to populous suburban districts, but exclusively to rural districts, and if I am not very much mistaken, the population of these districts is not increasing, but rather diminishing, as the recent census has proved. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman has told us that he is a member for Buckinghamshire. I have the honour to represent the Radnor Boroughs—(a laugh)—a constituency in Wales; and in many districts of Wales, where this grievance is felt to the utmost, I know that many churchyards are very thinly inhabited because there is only a scattered population, and the right hon. gentleman will find there no excuse for closing them. How will the sanitary treatment of this question by the Treasury Bench cope with this grievance? You are mistaken if you suppose that you will allay this agitation by reducing the area in which it operates; you are mistaken if you suppose that the Dissenters and the large body of Nonconformists who live in the large towns will abandon the rights of their brethren in the rural districts. As long as there is any one place in which inhabitants of a parish must be buried with rites to which they object in their lifetime, and which their relations and friends do not approve, or else must be buried without any service at all—(cheers)—as long as that grievance exists in a single parish I do not believe that you will allay this agitation. I have no doubt that before very long this question will be settled. I believe that it will be met in one of three ways—it must either be ignored, or compromised, or the grievance must be removed. The speeches of many of the clergy and many of the supporters of the right hon. gentleman show that they have been seeking earnestly, but hitherto in vain, for some reasonable compromise of this question. The right hon. gentleman sitting upon the Treasury Bench is disposed to ignore this question, or, at all events, to reduce it to the level of a sanitary measure. I believe that the well-meant efforts of the supporters of the Government who wish for a compromise will not succeed, because those hon. members have not yet hit upon a practical form of compromise on which they themselves are agreed. I believe that the sense of justice of the people will reject the mode of treatment of this subject proposed by the Government, and I believe the solution of the question which sooner or later the House will be constrained to adopt will be that which is proposed by the resolution of the hon. and learned gentleman. (Cheers.)

Mr. NEVILLE endeavoured to address the House from the Ministerial side in support of the resolution, but was not heard in the impatient cries for a division.

The House divided with the following result:—

For the resolution ...	...	248
Against ...	...	279
Majority against	...	—31

The motion was therefore lost.

The announcement of the numbers was received with loud cheers and counter cheers.

After some other business the House adjourned at a quarter to two o'clock.

SACRED HARMONIC SOCIETY.—Handel's oratorio, *Samson*, will be performed at Exeter Hall on Friday next, 10th inst. This work, composed in 1741, was a great favourite with its composer, and contains many very fine airs and choruses, among the former "Total Eclipse," "Honour and Arms," and "Let the Bright Seraphim" (with trumpet obbligato), are the most popular, while among the latter, the choruses "Then Round about the Starry Throne," "Fixed in His Everlasting Seat," and "Let their Celestial Concerts," are examples of the composer's finest choral writing. The work will be given with the additional accompaniments by Sir Michael Costa, who, we are glad to hear, was sufficiently recovered from his recent severe indisposition to direct the rehearsal on Friday last. Madame Edith Wynne, Madame Patey, Mr. Fabrini, Mr. George Fox, Mr. Lewis Thomas, are the principal vocalists.

The chair in which Mr. Moody sat during the Philadelphia meetings, says the New York *Independent*, brought 100 dols. at an auction sale, Mr. Sankey's chair fifty-five dollars, "and four towels upon which the evangelists had wiped their heated brows, five dollars apiece." The *Independent* asks, Will it do for us to poke fun at the Catholic fondness for relics after that?

SECOND EDITION, NOW READY,

THE PARACLETE:

AN ESSAY ON THE PERSONALITY AND MINISTRY OF THE HOLY GHOST, WITH SOME REFERENCE TO CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.

By Rev. JOSEPH PARKER, D.D.

"A most valuable exposition and defence of what may be called the deepest Christian spiritual philosophy, a noble specimen of the kind of teaching so much needed in all churches."—Theological Quarterly Review.

"Full of noble thoughts, wise counsels, pregnant suggestions, from which the Christian reader will receive comfort and help. We cordially commend this volume to our readers, assured that, after perusing it, they will find their difficulties somewhat lightened, their hearts somewhat cheered, and their faith somewhat strengthened by their communion with the mind of the author."—Nonconformist.

HENRY S. KING and CO., London.

LORD MACAULAY'S BIOGRAPHY AND EPISTOLARY REMAINS.

On Thursday, the 30th instant, in 2 vols. 8vo, price 36s.,

THE LIFE and LETTERS of LORD MACAULAY. By his nephew, GEORGE O. TREVELYAN, M.P.

London: Longmans and Co.

SUPPLEMENTARY SERIES.

Ancient Classics for English Readers.

EDITED BY THE REV. W. LUCAS COLLINS, A.M.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The marked success and general popularity of the Series of "ANCIENT CLASSICS FOR ENGLISH READERS," lately concluded in Twenty Volumes, has been accompanied by some regrets, expressed both by the friendly critics of the press and in private quarters, at its not having been made somewhat more comprehensive.

This has induced us to announce the issue of a "Supplementary Series," intended to comprise the works of some few Latin and Greek authors which, for various reasons, were not included in the original plan.

This Series will appear, like the preceding, in quarterly volumes, at half-a crown each, and in the same size and type. It will not be extended beyond eight or ten such volumes. These will include the works of ARISTOTLE, THUCYDIDES, DEMOSTHENES, LIVY, LUCRETIUS, OVID, CATULLUS (with TIBULLUS and PROPERTIUS), ANACREON, PINDAR, &c.

THE NEW VOLUME,

LIVY,

BY THE REV. W. LUCAS COLLINS, A.M.

Is published this day, price 2s. 6d.

Extracts from Reviews of the First Series.

"It is impossible to praise too highly the conception and execution of this series of Classics. They are a kind of 'Bibliotheca Classicorum' for unlearned readers, but executed by men of the most accomplished scholarship, and therefore conveying the very colour and tone of the authors. They will be as pleasant to scholars as they are valuable to those who only know their mother tongue."—British Quarterly Review.

"It is difficult to estimate too highly the value of such a series as this in giving 'English readers' an insight, exact as far as it goes, into those olden times which are so remote and yet to many of us so close."—Saturday Review.

All the Volumes of the First Series may be had separately, price 2s. 6d. in cloth; or the whole bound in ten vols., vellum backs, for £2 10s.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, Edinburgh and London.

Sold by all Booksellers.

THE RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY'S LIST.

BOOKS ON SANCTIFICATION.

1. **Sanctification as Exhibited in the WORD OF GOD**: commenced on Earth, perfected in Heaven. Small 8vo, 8d., cloth boards.
2. **Remarks on Recent Awakenings and HIGHER HOLINESS.** Words for the Times. By A. MOODY STUART, D.D. Imperial 32mo. 6d. limp cloth.
3. **The Spirit of Life; or, Scripture** Testimony to the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Spirit. By the Rev. E. BICKERSTETH, M.A. 4s. cloth boards.
4. **Steps on the Upward Path; or, Holiness** to the Lord. Fscp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth boards.
5. **Emily Ellet's Journal; or, Steps** towards a Better Life. Crown 8vo. 3s. bevelled boards, gilt edges.

BOOKS OF DAILY PORTIONS.

1. **Thoughts of Christ for Every Day of THE YEAR.** By the late Lord KINLOCH. Fscp. 8vo. 3s. 6d., cloth boards.
2. **Daily Watchwords: Morning** Thoughts on Scripture Texts. By M. A. S. M. Reprinted from "The Sunday at Home." Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d., cloth boards.
3. **Drops from the Brook by the way.** A Text and Prayer for Every Day in the Year. 2s. cloth boards.
4. **Acceptable Words. Choice Quotations** and Scripture Texts for every Day in the Year. Collected and arranged by S. M. L. Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth boards.
5. **Family Prayers for a Month (MORNING AND EVENING).** Contributed by various Evangelical Ministers. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d., cloth boards, red edges.
6. **Family Readings from the Gospel of ST. MATTHEW.** By Rev. F. BOURDILLON, M.A. 3s. 6d. cloth boards.

London: The Religious Tract Society, 56 & 60, Paternoster Row, and 164, Piccadilly. Manchester: 100, Corporation Street. Brighton: 31, Western Road.

*** Catalogues of the Society's Publications may be had GRATIS from the Depositories, or through any Bookseller.

Just published, crown 8vo, cloth, price 5s,

THE CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL. A Practical Guide to the Study of the amended New Testament. By WILLIAM CARTAN, Esq.

Williams and Norgate, 14, Henrietta-street, Covent-garden, London; and 20, South Frederick-street, Edinburgh.

Now ready, No. 1, March, 1876, price 2s. 6d,

THE LANGHAM MAGAZINE. Edited by Rev. C. VOYSEY, B.A.

CONTENTS.

1. Introductory. By the Editor.
2. The Future of Asia. By Professor F. W. Newman.
3. Thoughts on Strikes and Trades Unions. By the Rev. Brooke Lambert, Vicar of Tamworth.
4. Health and Holiday Haunts. Cheltenham.
5. An Agricultural Rip Van Winkle. By W. E. Bear.
6. The Course of True Love (founded on fact). By Ascott R. Hope.
7. The Stone Age in Europe. By Edward Clodd, F.R.A.S.
8. Religion By the Editor.

London: Samuel Deacon & Co., 150, Leadenhall-street, E.C.

Just published,

MEMORIALS of the late Rev. CHARLES NEW, for Ten Years Missionary in Eastern Africa, and Corresponding Member of the Royal Geographical Society. By the Rev. S. S. BARTON. Price 2s. 6d.: gilt edges, 3s.

London: T. Newton, Methodist Free Church Bookroom, 119, Salisbury-square, Fleet-street, and all Booksellers.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD BILL.

At a Meeting of the Executive Committee of the SOCIETY FOR THE LIBERATION OF RELIGION FROM STATE-PATRONAGE AND CONTROL, held March 2, 1876, it was RESOLVED as follows:—

"The Committee having examined the provisions of the Bill relating to the government of the University of Oxford and the Colleges therein, are of opinion that the measure is in several respects seriously defective, and is otherwise open to grave objection.

"1. While professing not to repeal any provision of the Universities Tests Act of 1871, it does virtually repeal an important portion of that Act, by enacting (sec. 42) that each statute made under the Bill shall have effect as if it 'had been made, and was in operation, at the passing of the Universities Tests Act of 1871.' The Bill will, therefore, enable the Commissioners to re-impose clerical restrictions in connection with offices and emoluments which have been thrown open, and also to found new clerical offices out of funds now applied to undenominational uses. (See subsections 1 and 2 of section 3 of Universities Tests Act, 1871.)

"2. The Bill will prevent the abolition of clerical headships of the colleges; inasmuch as it expressly withholds from the Commissioners power to alter the conditions of eligibility to headships (sec. 16).

"3. The Committee are of opinion that, in the interest of religious equality, it is absolutely essential that the Bill—

"(a) Should remove the sectarian restrictions which now limit Headships and Fellowships of Colleges to the clergy of the Church of England.

"(b) Should uphold the provision of the University Reform Act of 1854, requiring that College emoluments shall be conferred according to personal merit and fitness.

"(c) Should provide that no office, emolument, fund, endowment, or benefit whatsoever, which may be created, or be increased, under the Bill, shall have attached to it any obligation, either in the holder, or in those who have powers of appointment, to be a member of any Church, or to conform to any religious observance.

"They will therefore take steps to endeavour to secure such alterations in the measure as will make it a means of giving complete effect to the principles affirmed by the Legislature in passing the Act of 1871, with the confident expectation that they will have the zealous co-operation of all who desire that the national Universities should be open to the nation without any sectarian distinctions."

HENRY R. ELLINGTON, Chairman.
J. CARVELL WILLIAMS, Secretary.

2, Serjeants'-inn, Fleet-street.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

"The College adheres to its original principle of freely imparting Theological knowledge, without insisting on the adoption of particular Theological doctrines."

The Trustees of Manchester New College offer for Competition TWO SCHOLARSHIPS of £50 per annum, tenable for two years, at any British or Irish University.

At the time of receiving the Scholarship each scholar is to furnish a written statement that it is his bona fide intention to enter Manchester New College as a Divinity Student the first session after graduation.

The Examination will be held at University Hall, Gordon-square, London, W.C., on THURSDAY and FRIDAY, May 11th and 12th, at 9 a.m.

For further particulars apply to—

R. D. DARBISHIRE, Esq., B.A., 26, George-street, Manchester; or,
Rev. CHARLES BEARD, B.A., 13, South Hill-road, Liverpool.

THEOBALD, BROTHERS and MIALL, Accountants, 30, Mark-lane, London, CONDUCT INQUIRIES for PARTNERSHIPS in a confidential but effective manner. Businesses selected after scrutiny and recommended to clients. A small fixed percentage charged upon completing negotiations only. Terms on application, or free by post.

ORPHAN WORKING SCHOOL, HAVERSTOCK HILL.

Instituted May 10, 1758.

For Orphans and other necessitous Children of both sexes from any part of the United Kingdom.

Eligible between the ages of 7 and 11.

75 Orphans were admitted in 1875.

410 Orphans now in the Institution.

£10,000 a year needed to maintain its present efficiency.

SUBSCRIPTIONS will be thankfully received by

JOHN KEMP WELCH, Treasurer.
JONADAB FINCH, Secretary.

Offices, 73, Cheapside, London, E.C.

HOME FOR LITTLE BOYS, near Farningham, Kent

The Committee very earnestly APPEAL for FUNDS to enable them to feed, clothe, educate, and train to industrial work the three hundred homeless little boys who have been rescued from misery and crime, and who are now in the ten cottage homes at Farningham.

A. O. CHARLES, Secretary.

Office, Ludgate Circus, E.C. (corner of St. Bride-street.

CONTINENTAL EDUCATION.—CAROLINEN INSTITUT, FRANKENTHAL, GERMANY.

EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENT FOR YOUNG LADIES.

Principal—FRAULEIN BRAUN, assisted by good masters and resident governesses from Germany, France, Italy, and England.

Average number of German day-scholars 45, of German boarders 15, of English 5.

Pupils prepared for the German Government Examinations.

Frankenthal is situated close to the Railway Line upwards from Cologne, between Mayence and Heidelberg, being about an hour's distance by rail from each.

References kindly permitted to Professor Dr. J. P. Lange, Bonn-Rhein; and James Gordon, Esq., M.K., 227, King's-street, Aberdeen.

For prospectuses and further particulars apply either to the Principal, or to H. Braun, Esq., West Derby, near Liverpool.

INDEPENDENT COLLEGE, TAUNTON.

PRESIDENT—J. P. Spencer, Esq., Oakhill.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

G. B. Sully, Esq., Bridgwater. | W. H. Wills, Esq., Bristol.
F. Spencer, Esq., Oakhill.

PRINCIPAL—Rev. W. H. Griffith, M.A. (Lond.)
SECOND MASTER—Thos. Powell, Esq, M.A. (Oxon.)
MATHEMATICAL MASTER—J. McKenzie, Esq., B.A.
FIRST ENGLISH MASTER—J. C. Lambert Esq., B.A.
(Assisted by Five Resident Masters.)

SECRETARY—Mr. Edward Bayly.

Prospectuses may be had upon application to the Principal or the Secretary.

A Junior School for Pupils from seven to ten years of age.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY.—The Committee are anxious to obtain the services of a competent Scholar, Graduate of a University, as SUPERINTENDENT of the Translating and Editorial Department.—Particulars will be forwarded on application to the Secretaries, 146, Queen Victoria-street, London, E.C.

DR. WILLIAMS'S SCHOLARSHIPS.

Dr. Williams's Trustees announce TWO VACANCIES in the UNIVERSITY of GLASGOW during the current year.

Also TWO DIVINITY SCHOLARSHIPS OPEN for COMPETITION to GRADUATES.

For particulars apply to the Secretary, at the Library, Grafton-street (Gower-street), W.C.

CHAPPELL AND CO.'S,

50, NEW BOND STREET, W.

ONE HUNDRED VARIETIES OF ALEXANDRE ORGAN HARMONIUMS,
ALEXANDRE ORGANS,
AND PIPE ORGANS,
FOR THE DRAWING ROOM,
FOR THE CHURCH,
FOR THE SCHOOL,

FROM 4 TO 200 GUINEAS.

May be tried side by side with American Organs by the best makers.

CHAPPELL and CO. beg respectfully to intimate that the adaptability of the above Instruments for the purposes indicated has elicited most favourable testimony. Their construction is characterised by several specialities, producing increased sweetness of tone and effecting vast improvements in the general working. Messrs. C. and CO. have adopted the

THREE-YEARS' SYSTEM OF HIRE AND PURCHASE,

COMMENCING FROM 5 GUINEAS PER ANNUM AND UPWARDS.

ILLUSTRATED LIST, WITH TESTIMONIALS, FREE BY POST.

CHAPPELL AND CO.,

50, NEW BOND STREET, W., LONDON.

A FAMILY, residing at Blackheath, moving in good society, and having only one daughter, wish to RECEIVE into their home a YOUNG LADY, of about 12, as companion and to attend classes with their daughter. Unusual advantages and home comforts. Terms, including school fees, 100 Guineas.—Address, "Filia," care of Mr. G. Street, 30, Cornhill, E.C.

CONGREGATIONAL UNION LECTURE.

CHANGE OF TIME.—DR. MELLOR'S next LECTURE (TUESDAY, March 14), and all the following Lectures on the Priesthood, will be delivered in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon-street, at SEVEN o'clock, instead of half-past Seven as formerly advertised.

ALEXANDER HANNAY, Secretary.

STAMFORD TERRACE ACADEMY, ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE.

Established 1829, by the late Mr. Sunderland.

Prospectuses, &c., will be forwarded on application to DANIEL F. HOWORTH, Principal.

THE LADIES' HIGH CLASS SCHOOL, MOIRA HOUSE, UPPER ADDISCOMBE ROAD, CROYDON, SURREY.

Principals—Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES B. INGHAM and the Misses CONNAH.

This School is established on the Collegiate System in furtherance of the principles for the higher education of women.

The training, moral, mental, and physical, is thoroughly systematised and carefully graded, and is under the guidance of trained and experienced teachers.

Each class meets in a separate room, and a laboratory has been added, in which the Senior Students are practically instructed in Chemistry and Physics.

Especial attention is given to the various branches of English, which are taught in a manner both efficient and interesting.

The Principals having resided for some time abroad are enabled to ensure to the pupils the practical acquirement of the Continental languages.

Unusual interest is attached to the study of Music by the combination of the Theory with the Practice, and by attention to rhythm.

References to well-known Congregational ministers and gentlemen.

For Prospectuses and names of referees, apply to the Principals.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The NONCONFORMIST is supplied Post-free on the following terms:—

CREDIT.—Annually, 24s.; Half-yearly, 12s.; Quarterly, 6s.

PREPAID.—Annually, 21s.

Cheques and Post-office Orders payable (at Chief Office) to W. R. Willcox, Publisher,

18, Bouverie-street, London, E.C.

*** The Guinea rate can only be accorded to Annual Subscribers, but may commence at any date.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A HIGH CHURCH RECTOR and S. S. JERDAN. Next week.

*** A number of communications in type have been unavoidably excluded this week in consequence of the great pressure on our space.

S. COX (Cape Town). P. O. O. (1*l.* 3s. 2d.) received, with thanks.

The Nonconformist.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1876.

SUMMARY.

THE weather was yesterday highly favourable to the royal visit to the East-end of London, being bright and dry. Tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands of people, witnessed the procession from Buckingham Palace to Whitechapel, and gave Her Majesty a loyal if not an enthusiastic greeting as her open carriage passed through the crowded and profusely decorated streets—a welcome which became warmer as the *cortege* neared the London Hospital, where the Queen was to open a new and extensive wing, towards the cost of which the Grocers' Company gave the munificent donation of 20,000*l.* Her Majesty was received by the officials of the hospital and a multitude of select visitors in a spacious pavilion where the ceremonial of the day took place; the building being duly declared to be open by Mr. Secretary Cross on behalf of the Queen. Apart from the good effect of this auspicious meeting of the Sovereign with so many thousands of her subjects of all classes, the royal visit has been of great service to this magnificent hospital, which even now contains 600 patients and yearly affords surgical help and advice to some 10,000 out-patients. Donations to the extent of 70,000*l.*, exclusive of the gift of the Grocers' Company, will be a munificent memento of Her Majesty's visit to the great East-end charity.

Besides the debate on the burials question, the House of Commons has been largely occupied with discussions on the Army Estimates, which were explained in detail by Mr. Hardy on Thursday evening. The total amount is somewhat over fifteen millions and a quarter—an increase of about 604,000*l.* on the Estimates of last year. The Secretary for War proposes to increase the soldiers' pay—to which no one can fairly object—at the rate of twopence per day, payable in a lump sum (18*l.*) on the completion of six years' service; but he adds the amount to the Estimates instead of saving it by retrenchment—to which many very reasonably object, for we are spending on our military forces some two millions and a-half more than four years ago. The right hon. gentleman expects when Mr. Cardwell's scheme has been fully carried out, that a well-appointed army of 30,000 men, in addition to three regiments of the Guards, will be secured. On the first vote being proposed, Mr. Pease moved a reduction of 10,000 men, on the ground that an army of regulars and auxiliaries of 526,000 is the largest peace establishment which England has ever been asked to provide, is larger than the country requires, and that this country is on cordial relations with foreign Powers; but he eventually withdrew the amendment. On Monday, when the discussion was resumed, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, in a telling speech, moved, "That the interests of the nation do not demand an increased expenditure on the land forces," and made a despairing appeal to the Opposition leaders to support that retrenchment which was the pledge and the earnest of peace. Mr. Richard, in seconding the resolution, called on the Ministry of this country, to take the lead in inviting Europe to terminate this system of wild expenditure on gigantic armaments, and on Parliament to show by a reduction of our forces that peace was really the policy of this country. But the amendment was rejected by a majority of 129, only sixty-three members having the courage to support it. Before progress was reported a large instalment of the Army Estimates was voted.

The presentation by Mr. Cardwell in the House of Lords last night of a petition from the London Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Three Denominations, praying for the withdrawal of the second Fugitive Slave Circular, led to an interesting and important debate. The emphatic declarations made by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Derby, Lord Selborne, and Lord Coleridge were of value as showing the wholesome influence of public opinion, but the whole tenour of the discussion went to show—first, that there was no real necessity for the issue of fresh instructions last autumn, and second, that the appointment of a royal commission was superfluous and may have an injurious effect.

In the House of Commons on Monday evening Mr. J. J. Colman asked a series of questions in reference to the British School, Wrentham, to which the reply of Lord Sandon was eminently evasive and unsatisfactory. It will be remembered that a school board was duly elected, and that it was proposed to transfer to it the existing British School. The department did not take the usual and legal course of sanctioning the creation of a board, but delayed seven months in order that the National School might be enlarged, so that it might be said there was adequate accommodation. We regret that it is out of our power this week to state the whole of the circumstances in detail, which show that the department in this case has been scandalously playing into the hands of the Church party, if not violating its own regulations of 1871. In his reply on Monday night Lord Sandon altogether evaded this point, in reference to which and to the other portion of his lordship's reply, we have received a letter from the Rev. John Browne. The following is the most important part of that communication, for the whole of which we are quite unable to find room:—

> Lord Sandon says, "It would be unfair to those who had complied with the requirements of the department if the school board were now allowed to take over the British School and throw the burden of its maintenance upon the ratepayers generally." Upon which I observe that we also have complied with the requirements of the department and *with the provisions of the Act*, and that it is not only unfair but unlawful for the department to violate the rules laid down in their minutes and sanctioned by Parliament, which in this case they have done, even though we actually provided at our own cost in 1871, under their direction, all the accommodation the neighbourhood required. The parish, twice in vestry assembled, has requested a board in order that it might have an undenominational school under its own direction, and at a poll of the parish three-fifths of the ratepayers voted for this purpose—and now my lords say it would be unfair that these three-fifths should obtain their object because two-fifths, in order to prevent them, have been putting up a school which was not wanted, and which at the time they began to build was quite superfluous!
>
> We have a board, and that board must not have a school under its care, though it can have one without cost of building, just simply because some people have, during the negociations with the Government, been building what was not necessary. Their lordships knew on October 16, 1874, that there was sufficient accommodation in the district according to their own showing—the additional accommodation has all been provided since then, and yet this additional unnecessary accommodation so provided is now given as a reason why our board should not have a school, as it would be unfair to those foolish builders who erected an unnecessary school which has not been used yet, and is not likely to be, which is not even furnished, but is a vast howling wilderness!
>
> But the worst is that, in order to secure this result their lordships have not acted according to their own rules, and Lord Sandon has shrunk from answering the main question proposed.

The matter ought not to rest here, but should be brought before Parliament in a formal shape, as involving questions of great moment in the administration of the Elementary Education Act.

The new French Constitution now finds expression in a visible and well-nigh perfect form. Both Houses of the Legislature are completed. As is well known, the Senate contains a majority of Republicans. So also, in larger measure, does the Chamber of Deputies. The second ballots in 105 districts were taken on Monday, and considerably increased the majority of the Liberal party in that Assembly. The following is an approximate estimate of the relative position of parties:—Republicans of all shades, 270; Bonapartists, 92; Liberal-Conservatives, 58; Radicals, 60; Legitimists, 36—total, 530; counting ten double and four colonial elections. It would thus appear that the Republicans, exclusive of the Radicals, considerably outnumber all the rest put together, and represent a breadth of popular opinion which even the Bonapartists cannot call in question. It is probable that M. Grévy will be the President of the Deputies, but its leader without question will be M. Gambetta, to whose energy and moderation this signal Liberal triumph is so largely due.

The new chambers will assemble to-day, *pro formâ*, but it is not certain that there will be a definite Government to meet them. No doubt M. Dufaure will be the head of the new Cabinet, but the demand of Marshal MacMahon that the three important portfolios of War, Marine, and Foreign Affairs shall not be dependent on Legislative approval, has retarded the formation of the Government and induced M. Casimir Périer to decline the Ministry of the Interior. Probably the prudence of the President and the forbearance of the two Chambers will eventually bring about a satisfactory arrangement. But knotty questions will remain to be solved when the Cabinet has been definitely constituted. The programme of M. Gambetta and his majority embraces a weeding-out of Bonapartist prefects; the local election, instead of the nomination by the Government, of the mayors of the Communes; restrictions on the new clerical Universities; and the recommendation of a limited amnesty. How far the President, who apparently will still claim a voice in political decisions, and his responsible adviser, M. Dufaure, will be prepared to concede these demands, time will show. The one has the reputation of sympathising to a large extent with the clericals; the other with having a somewhat cynical contempt for public opinion.

ADMINISTRATIVE CORRUPTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

RECENT communications despatched hither from America by the cable, cast a disagreeably lurid light upon certain administrative departments of the Government at Washington. There is the affair of the Emma Mine which involves—we hope and believe quite undeservedly—the reputation of General Schenck, the late American Minister to the British Court. There are what are called the Whisky Frauds, which are still under investigation; and there is the impeachment of Mr. Secretary Belknap, and the flight to Canada of Mr. Marsh, the principal witness against him, for having disposed of the position of Post Trader at Fort Sill for a considerable sum of money. As yet, we are not in possession of detailed evidence sufficient to warrant a final judgment in any of the cases above referred to. The charges brought against officials high in the confidence of President Grant may hereafter be established upon a basis of solid proof, or they may not. They may turn out to have been the fruit of party rancour, or inevitable conclusions from facts until now buried in secrecy. We do not presume to pronounce an opinion at the present immature stage of the several cases. We can well understand, however, that these recent exposures, or at any rate semblances of exposure, have excited "a very feverish condition of feeling in political circles" in the United States, and that, as the American correspondent of the London *Times* intimates, "rumours of all kinds are afloat affecting the integrity of high Government officials." There would appear to be *primâ facie* grounds for a suspicion that the administrative officers of the Union government are permeated by a spirit of corruption, discreditable to the country and the age; and should this suspicion be substantiated we cannot but believe that it will exercise a great, possibly a startling, influence upon the future course of American politics.

We hope we shall not be misunderstood as to

the general purport of these and the following observations. We are not about to cast a stone at American institutions, even if it should appear that the practical working of them by unworthy hands has evolved these scandals. Scoundrelism, unhappily, is not by any means an American monopoly. There is too good reason to believe that it exists and thrives commercially in our own country. We have little warrant for gathering our garments together with affected modesty, and exclaiming *proh pudor!* But we hope that official circles at home are comparatively, if not entirely, uncontaminated by the meanness of pecuniary corruption. Jobs, we have no doubt, are occasionally stooped to, even by men of high reputation in the public service. But whatever may have been the case in days long gone by, we have reason to hope that in the present day official influence is rarely, if ever, bought or sold for a money consideration. Our public men are free from the slightest suspicion of dabbling in administrative politics with a view to pecuniary gain. They are as much above taking sordid bribes as are the judges of the realm. The course of administration in this country is generally believed, and we hope justly believed, to have purged itself clear of this feculence. It is not impossible that in the lower and more subordinate grades of Government *employés* occasional transactions occur which would not bear the light; but the people of England rest in an assured conviction, amply sustained by facts, that high political circles at all events are not invaded by that greed after filthy lucre which would sell for it any trust imposed by public responsibility.

Nor is it to be inferred that the American people have any sympathy with this official vice. That it has increased power in political matters is due, perhaps, to causes partly accidental; partly also arising out of defective patriotism. The staid, sober, honest, and well-to-do citizens of the Republic have left its affairs to be managed largely by professional politicians and party wire-pullers. To a considerable extent, they have abnegated their political duties. They were unwilling to touch pitch lest they should be defiled. They shrank from the rowdyism which usually plays an important part in the tactical management of universal suffrage. They restricted their attention mainly to their private business, their intellectual culture, their social, philanthropic, and religious enterprises. It thus happened that political affairs fell mainly into the hands of men who made the guidance of them their profession. The result has been what we see. There is, perhaps, less integrity of character, less sensitiveness of honour, less regard to the dictates of high-minded morality, in association with the political government of the States than in any other sphere. Corruption has eaten its way upwards through all the administrative departments, and it seems quite uncertain whether Democrats or Republicans have become the more deeply tainted by it. The non-political classes have looked upon its progress with too great indifference. They will now possibly rouse themselves from apathy, and will give one proof more that when they choose to exert the electoral power which they possess they are strong enough to carry with them almost any extent of reformation they please.

President Grant, we believe, has not personally implicated himself by succumbing to any of the temptations which surround his office. It is not anticipated that any charge, even if made against him, of bartering the use of his patronage for self, will be likely to be sustained. But there must be something radically defective and faulty in the tone of his administration, which has contributed to bring about such lamentable results. We readily assume that he has at no time deliberately connived at dishonesty in the Ministers whom he has chosen. Whether he has put the telescope to the blind eye is, perhaps, more doubtful. At any rate, he can hardly have exercised that degree of vigilance which became him in his supreme office. The country will not entirely exculpate him from all responsibility for the disasters it now witnesses. There was a hope at one time that he would energetically set about the reform of the Civil Service. He seems to have done less than nothing to justify that hope. His *entourage* sheds but little lustre upon the character of his administration. He need not cherish, we fancy, any expectation of being elected to the Presidential chair for a third term. His friends have cut but a very sorry figure in the eyes of the country, and probably there now remains but little hope among the people of the United States that laxity of administration will ever be succeeded by honesty and vigour whilst General Grant continues to fill the post of Chief Magistrate of the Republic.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY BILL.

We are now able to examine the provisions of Lord Salisbury's Bill, which was published too late for us to do so last week. Had we taken the speech as an exposition of the bill, we should have been very much mistaken. And now, recommending our readers to treat that speech as throwing no light on the bill, we will proceed to discuss the scheme laid before Parliament.

In brief, this is a plan to re-endow the clergy; to repeal a large part of the University Tests Act; and to secure to the clerical Tory party the complete control over the colleges and the University.

There is no power under the bill to touch the clerical restrictions on the headships of colleges, but there *is* power to unite the headships to clerical offices in the colleges or in the University. When this is done the college will be unable hereafter to repeal the clerical restriction; and thus while the bill apparently leaves these clerical restrictions alone, it really enables the commissioners to tie them tighter round the necks of the colleges.

Secondly, the commissioners are to be invested with authority to abolish a large number of open fellowships and convert them into offices of the University. Thus, by merely leaving the clerical fellowships alone, their voting power in the colleges will be enormously increased by increasing the proportion which they will bear to the others.

Thirdly, the commissioners may alter without limitation the way of appointing to college offices. Thus they may abolish the system of election by merit after examination, and reintroduce patronage, favour, and restrictions. The old Act contained a direction that emoluments should be conferred by personal merit and fitness, and the ordinances framed under that Act directed an examination as the means of ascertaining that merit. But now the commissioners are free to disregard all rules, and may cause places to be filled up as they please. There is nothing in the bill to prevent the commissioners giving the power of appointment to the episcopal visitor or to the bishop of the diocese.

Fourthly, the commissioners have power by the 42nd section to set aside the provision of the University Tests Act 1871 prohibiting the foundation of any fresh clerical or denominational offices in the University. This bill enacts that every statute made under it shall be deemed to have been made before the passing of the University Tests Act of 1871; and as that Act saved from its operation all clerical restrictions in force before its passing, the commissioners will be enabled to reimpose clerical restrictions on all the fellowships and professorships which are now lay, and to found new offices limited to the clergy. Moreover there is nothing in the bill to prevent the commissioners adding to the endowment of offices now clerical from the general funds which will be at their disposal.

Fifthly, the bill takes away from the colleges the power which they now have of amending these statutes by providing that statutes made by their commissioners may only be altered by the University on the application of two-thirds of the college. The governing bodies of the colleges, be it remembered, are, as a rule, elected openly by merit, and are ready to introduce reforms. The governing body of the University being composed of all the graduates, is mostly clerical, and quite alien from all interest in or understanding of the details of academic administration. This proposal, therefore, will for the future tie the hands of all reformers by making them wait on the pleasure of an anti-reforming and uninformed body.

Again, hitherto alterations of ordinances and statutes made by the colleges and University have had to be sanctioned by the Queen in Council. But this bill provides (Section 40, coupled with Sections 31, 32, and 33) that in future, unless the proposed alteration of the statute be illegal, there shall be no power of reviewing it on the ground of policy by the Queen in Council, but only on the ground of illegality; and thus the nation is shut out from the voice it has at present through the Ministry in checking the modifications in the statutes of the national University. When it is remembered that this bill gives power, not only to the commissioners, but hereafter to the colleges, with the consent of the University, to reimpose clerical tests, it will be seen how serious this proposal is. Apparently, the bill gives wide power to the commissioners to abolish clerical restrictions upon fellowships. But unless there are express words authorising the commissioners to abolish all clerical restrictions there are words in sections thirteen and fourteen which may be construed by the commissioners as instructions to retain them. First, Section 13 desires the commissioners to have regard to the main intention of the founder where it has not been neglected or set aside. And, though clerical restrictions are not really part of the main intention of the founder, yet, if a Tory commission chooses to say they are—and there are no direct words in the bill to the contrary—it will be hard for a reforming college to persuade them. Then Section 14 says that the Commissioners in their scheme shall have regard to the interests "of religion, learning, and research." Hitherto all reference to religion has as a rule been a matter of preamble, not of substantive enactment, and therefore has not imposed any restriction on legislation. Thus the Oxford University Reform Act, 1854, recites:—"Whereas it is expedient for the advancement of religion and learning to enlarge the powers, &c."; and again, Section 28 recites:—"And whereas it is expedient for the interest of religion and learning to enable colleges to alter and amend their statutes," &c. But when it comes to the substantive part of the section it enables them to abolish restrictions, to open to competition, but there is nothing said about giving favour to any Church or imposing any clerical restrictions; and though in the 30th Section there is again a reference to "Religion and learning," yet the object of the section was to enable the former commissioners to deal freely with trusts and throw them open—not to impose fresh restrictions. Religion is mentioned elsewhere in the old Acts, but the word has never hitherto been used as the mask for sectarian ascendancy. Unfortunately, we know that, in consequence of the establishment of a Church in this country, the Court of Chancery will construe any reference to religion in the operative part of a foundation to mean the Established religion, and no doubt Lord Salisbury's Commissioners, if the bill is not made distinct in the other sense, will treat Section 14 as a direct instruction to them to give preferences to the Established Church in their schemes. Let Lord Salisbury, if he wants to give a religious colour to his bill, put religion in the preamble and say something to this effect—"Whereas, in the interests of religion, learning, and research, it is expedient that all sectarian preferences be abolished, and that the University of Oxford be reformed," &c. It certainly does seem that religion suffers by insincere language, which apparently says one thing and really means another, and also by the paid hypocrisy which submits to tests and to ordination for the sake of college emoluments. Religion also suffers by the littleness and uncharitableness which are roused by fighting in its name for worldly position and for wealth.

There are many defects in the bill which we may hereafter point out. Enough has been said to show that when Lord Salisbury dressed himself up in a reforming fancy dress, though the skin might be the skin of Esau, yet the voice was still the voice of Jacob.

SKETCHES FROM THE GALLERY.

House of Commons, Tuesday, 1 a.m.

What Mr. Disraeli's Administration has lost and is likely to lose by reason of the maladroitness of the First Lord of the Admiralty is in some measure counterbalanced by the personal qualities and Ministerial successes of the Secretary of State for War. Mr. Gathorne Hardy is as *habile* as Mr. Ward Hunt is unskilful, and that is a comparison that carries the superlative close up to the outmost limit of possibility. Mr. Gathorne Hardy's statement on Thursday night, when introducing the Army Estimates was somewhat diffuse, and its delivery was marred by that breathless manner which much detracts from the force of the right hon. gentleman's Parliamentary utterances. But there was about it a charming air of frankness and a constant acknowledgment of the right of the House of Commons to exact and to receive the fullest information, which went far to counteract these influences. Moreover, Mr. Hardy showed a perfect mastery of his subject, and made it clear that he had been at work in improving the army, not only laboriously and energetically, but ietelligently and successfully. Lord Cardwell, regarding the work of his successor, might write under it, as Virgil wrote under the distich which Bathyllus claimed,—

Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.

But the fact that a Conservative Minister industriously and intelligently follows in the steps of a Liberal predecessor, and even carries further his improvements, is a state of affairs of which Liberals at least, and Lord Cardwell least of all, need not complain.

The Liberals who took part in the brief debate which time permitted on Thursday night certainly made no complaint, but rather vied with the Ministerialists in their appreciation of the Minister of War's labours and plans. Mr. Campbell-Banner-

man, the only representative of the War Department of the late Ministry on the front Opposition Bench, was obliged to justify his office by offering a few criticisms. But they related to unimportant details, and did not prevent him also from expressing his approval of the general management of the War Office. Amid this chorus of approval Mr. Pease's motion for reducing the number of men by 10,000 found no supporters, and was not even discussed. A prominent member sitting below the gangway, well known as an independent critic and the possessor of "views" chiefly economical on army affairs, told me on Friday that he had gone down to the House with the intention of supporting Mr. Pease's motion, but after hearing Mr. Hardy's statement he refrained, and even in the few remarks he made expressed an unusually unqualified approval. Mr. Whalley's interposition was exceedingly comical. The hon. member rose to support Mr. Holms's motion for an adjournment of the debate. At first sight it seemed that nothing could have been more unfortunate for Mr. Holms than this unsolicited championship. But in the end it turned out that nothing could have been more effective. Mr. Whalley, starting from a motion to report progress, discussed the system of recruiting, and gradually, but by steps the quickening of which the House watched with amused attention, arrived at his inevitable goal, and boldly charged the Jesuits with the accountability of the lessened stature and narrowing chest measurement of the British recruit. Checked by the chairman, he set off again, beginning in remote quarters, and, amid shouts of laughter, once more arriving at the priests. By the time he had finished the House was in such a condition of uproarious merriment that, as Mr. Disraeli admitted further progress was impossible; and so the debate was adjourned.

The debate on Mr. Osborne Morgan's resolution brought together the biggest House of the new Parliament, and the momentary fate of the Burials Bill was decided by the largest vote ever taken on the question. With 527 members voting on a division to triumph in which all the energies of the Government Whip have for some days been devoted, a hostile majority of thirty-one is much more like a victory than a defeat. It certainly scores the high-water mark of Conservative opposition to this particular demand of Nonconformity. Mr. Osborne Morgan's speech even went beyond the expectation of his friends in its effectiveness. The opening portions were the least successful, the hon. member not having gained a full mastery of his voice, and being perhaps hampered by the conviction that he was in some measure telling a thrice-told tale that might weary his audience. But the growing interest of the House reacted upon him, and the latter half of his speech was as vigorously delivered as it was clearly conceived and eloquently expressed. If the Liberation Society or others especially interested in the cause espoused by Mr. Osborne Morgan desire to bring before the public in a small space and in a conclusive form a conviction of the hopelessness of that staunch uncompromising resistance which, according to the Premier, the Conservatives are determined to give to the Burials Bill, they cannot do anything better than print and widely circulate Mr. Cross's speech in opposing the resolution. The Home Secretary is a moderately able man, whose training and practice secure him on ordinary occasions against damaging his own cause when pleading it. But on Thursday night, having to make an official and important declaration against the proposed changes in the matters of burials, the right hon. gentleman delivered one of the most telling arguments against the Established Church that has been spoken in the House of Commons since Mr. Miall left it. He forgot the Church in thinking of the churchyard, and, generally, afforded an illustration of the muddled state into which the mind of an ordinary intelligent man may fall when he sets himself deliberately to defend a cause which is logically untenable.

As for Mr. Disraeli, he, in his characteristically audacious manner, did not condescend to the pretence of arguing the question at all. Sir William Harcourt, watching him sit through the long hours of the debate with downcast head and expressionless face, surmised that he was devising schemes for escaping from the position in which he found himself. The device had already been determined upon in Cabinet Council, and what Mr. Disraeli was revolving in his mind more probably was the construction of one of those epigrammatic sentences with which he is accustomed to label the political and social questions of the day. He found it just before midnight, and used it with varied effect. "The question is not a sectarian but a sanitary one," he said; and from the Ministerial benches rose thunderous cheers, whilst the Liberals, on whom this astounding view came with a suddenness that seemed momentarily to take their breath away, presently answered with a burst of laughter that disconcerted even Mr. Disraeli. It was not, perhaps, the wisest or the most statesmanlike thing thus to narrow to an aphorism the point of view from which the Conservative party have decided to regard a question that touches the warmest and quickest feelings of millions of Englishmen and women. It dangerously bares the whole position. But this is not the first time that Mr. Disraeli has been content to sacrifice something substantial for the sake of obtaining currency for an epigram he has laboriously coined.

Such measure of interest as clung to the renewed debate on the Army Estimates on Monday night, suffered greatly by the discussion which suddenly sprang up on the Suez Canal purchase. In the abrupt dismissal of Sir Daniel Lange, Mr. Gladstone has been quick to see a proof of the emptiness of the boast that by expending four millions in the purchase of shares, Great Britain had acquired a commanding influence over the affairs of the company. Here was a favourable opportunity of exercising that influence, and Mr. Gladstone, much to Mr. Disraeli's discomfort, pressed it upon the attention of the Ministry and the House. He scored another point off a strange and even startling statement made in an off-hand way by the Premier, and which seemed to point to the sending out of a Commission to receive certain branches of Egyptian revenues, and apply the proceeds in the reduction of debt. Mr. Disraeli subsequently declared that he meant nothing by that, and that Mr. Gladstone's fears were groundless. But the right hon. gentlemen does not usually speak words which signify nothing, and unless Mr. Gladstone's vigorous speech scotched the snake in its infant growth, we shall hear something more of the scheme hereafter.

Religious and Denominational News.

BURSLEM.—The Rev. J. Fernie has resigned the pastorate of the church at Burslem, which he has held for more than eight years, having accepted an invitation to return to Natal. Mr. Fernie preached his farewell sermon on Sunday evening week, and on the following day a tea-meeting was held, at which presentations were made to the retiring minister by the church and congregation, by the senior classes of the Sunday-school, and by members of other churches and denominations.

BOLTON—MAUDSLEY-STREET NEW SCHOOLS.—On Feb. 23 a bazaar was opened in the new school premises connected with the above place of worship (pastor, Rev. Robert Best). The buildings consist of separate rooms for Sunday and day-school purposes, infant-room, lecture-hall, workingmen's room and twelve class-rooms, altogether affording accommodation for nearly a 1,000 scholars. The premises have cost about 3,500*l*. The bazaar was opened by Thomas Baines, Esq., J.P., chairman of the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway and High Sheriff of Denbighshire, who spoke of the benefit he received at Maudsley-street School in his youthful days. The bazaar realised the handsome sum of 950*l*., which, with previous subscriptions, enables the committee to open and furnish the schools free of debt.

GOSPORT.—In consequence of ill-health, and of medical advice, the Rev. W. H. Jellie has been obliged to resign charge of the church of Union Chapel, Stoke, Gosport, after a pastorate of five years. The *Portsmouth Times* says:—"During Mr. Jellie's residence in the town he has won the respect of most who knew him outside his own sect. He held the post of hon. secretary to the Hampshire Congregational Union, which he resigned some six months since, on account of ill-health. He was also a member of the Alverstoke Burial Board and of the committee of the Gosport School of Science and Art. Altogether we feel that Mr. Jellie's departure will be a loss to the town, which he quits in about three weeks." The church met on Thursday last, and passed the following resolution:—"That this meeting, having read the letter of the Rev. W. H. Jellie resigning the pastorate of the church, would express extreme regret and tender most affectionate sympathy to him in his great affliction, but in the face of his own statements and the advice of his physicians, feel that they can do no other than accept his resignation, and hope that his health may, by the blessing of God, be speedily restored, and that he may yet be spared many years for useful service in whatever sphere God may see fit to place him, and they would offer the sum of 150*l*. to the Rev. W. H. Jellie out of the 'general fund' of the church in recognition of his valuable services." A meeting to bid him farewell was also arranged to be held before the rev. gentleman leaves Gosport.

Literature.

*GROTE ON ETHICS.**

All readers of Mr. Grote's works must have been gratified to hear that amongst the papers left by him "there were discovered several essays in Ethics, which appeared to be sufficiently consecutive and complete to be given to the world." And probably all students of moral science will be glad to receive anything from the pen of one of the ablest of modern historians on this subject. Not even our knowledge of the side which Mr. Grote would occupy in ethical controversies would lessen our pleasure at receiving any contribution to their settlement from him. But we cannot go further than this and say, as some have done, that this volume is one of the most valuable additions which ethical science has received of late years. In the first place, the essays are not complete, and the most perfect in form is expository of the ethics of Aristotle; and, in the next place, they are all written in the interest of the Utilitarian school, and exhibit some of the worst features of it. They are analytical and critical; they deal with the origin of the moral sentiment rather than with its power or with its truth; they are concerned with the nature of the organ, not so much with its function.

But on this point we will let Mr. Grote speak for himself in a passage which they who differ most from his school would probably agree. "I believe," he says, "that those who have represented our moral sentiments as an aggregate of original and unaccountable instincts, have clung to this theory mainly from a fear that the ethical motive would be degraded and enfeebled, if the sentiment out of which it arises were admitted to be derivative and generated by association. The authority of the moral sentiments (they imagine) would not be adequately sustained, unless the belief could be established that they were natural and ready-made instincts—impressed upon the mind directly by Nature herself, or by the Divine Author of Nature—original revelation, or direct commands and impulses, from the Divinity to man." Mr. Grote then proceeds to show that nothing is gained in the way of authority by maintaining the supernatural origin, or instructive character, of these sentiments; for, he argues, all our instinctive appetites and impulses are placed under the restraints of reason; and, if the moral sentiments are of Divine origin, how can we account for their divergencies? Such being the belief repudiated in this volume, let us inquire, what is the view of its author as to right, obligation, and their sanctions. This we find specially in two essays; the first on the origin and nature of ethical sentiment; and the fourth on the idea of ethical philosophy. "Ethical sentiment is," we are told, "a very complicated sentiment, presupposing many trains of ideas and feelings, and deduced from several distinct, and even opposing elements of our nature; yet so combined together by habitual association as to affect the mind with the rapidity and instantaneousness of a simple feeling, no separate consciousness of the constituent items remaining." These elementary tendencies or separate items are our sense of dependence, "most urgently felt during the utter helplessness of childhood, at the time when the first associations are formed"—our sympathetic tendencies, and our affections of love and hatred—attractions and repulsions. This complex whole, made up of these several parts, becomes an ethical sentiment in virtue of its being a social sentiment, and having reference to man as a social being. We are both agents and patients, we do certain things and suffer other things; and as such we almost unconsciously pass from one character to the other, going without and placing ourselves amongst the spectators of our own actions, we form a judgment upon ourselves. This judgment, Mr. Grote contends, "is the main basis of what is properly ethical sentiment; which is essentially a social sentiment, conceivable only by a number of men living in some sort of communion more or less intimate and extensive. . . . . Again, "it is a sentiment of *regulated social reciprocity*. . . . . The reciprocity between the agent and the society consists in this, that although he does not expect to receive the protection or favour of society, except upon condition of certain conduct and certain dispositions on his part, failing which, he anticipates from them the contrary treatment—yet, on the other hand,

* *Fragments of Ethical Subjects.* By the late GEORGE GROTE, F.R.S. Being a selection from his Posthumous Papers. (London: John Murray. 1876.)

if he *has* duly performed these conditions, he conceives himself to have earned their protection or favour as a matter of right, and thinks they would do him wrong if they withheld it." It remains now only to seek an answer to a third question to have a complete account of our right, obligation, and sanction; that is, why should we act in this manner. The answer given here is, because Society will refuse you its protection if you do not. The idea of a sanction forms a constant of ethical sentiment. "The intimate connection established in the mind by association between good or ill desert and its consequences, drives us to conceive an ideal vinculum between them, under the form of a superintending and ever-watchful Providence, competent to punish, to compensate, or to reward." This is a very simple account of what to most men is a very difficult matter. Mr. Grote, however, belonged to a school which was intolerant of mystery. They believed that by means of their doctrine of relativity they had proved that there was no abiding reality in any belief the human mind could hold, whether in the science of numbers, space, or of morals. By means of what they call association they were able to piece together a few hopes and fears, generated they knew not how or by what, and give us the solemn and awful moral sentiment that belonged alike to the highest and the lowliest of mankind. But we ha e not met before with the bold announcement that the origin of a *superintending and ever-watchful Providence* was also due to association, We will only add that, in our opinion. this treatment of our ethical sentiments is practically useful when dealing with average moral natures, governed by positive laws. But these laws are silent in the great crises of human history; and it is the mission of great souls, who do not think of God as a creation of association, to reveal laws that are to them eternal realities, and so to lift the moral consciousness of society to a higher plane. The experience, association philosophy scarcely accounts for these men.

Altogether there are six essays in this volume. Two we have referred to, but there are three which are of special value, they were in the line of their author's classical studies. The first—the third in the volume—is on the ancient system of moral philosophy; the two last, on the ethics and politics of Aristotle. The volume is one that we gladly place beside the former works of Mr. Grote, and which, in spite of our fundamental difference from him on moral grounds, we cordially commend to our readers.

*MR. McCOLL'S DEFENCE.**

When we reviewed Mr. McColl's work we spoke of the vigour of his style as well as of his large acquaintance with ecclesiastical authorities. There is exhibited in this pamphlet a similar, and perhaps an unrivalled knowledge of authorities, and something more than vigour of style. Mr. McColl returns the abuse that has been heaped upon him with full interest. He stands up to his antagonists, and, after a volley of hard words, knocks them down one after another with a sort of gasping fury. Now, no doubt, it is painful to be accused of ignorance, and to have a book that one has spent much trouble upon, "cut up" and cut to pieces as the *Quarterly* and some other reviewers dealt with Mr. McColl's; but, after all, it is better to bear such things like a man than, as Mr. McColl does, like a clergyman. But, then, Mr. McColl is a clergyman, and perhaps it would be too much to expect him to rise superior to the habit of his order in matters of controversy.

Mr. McColl, it seems to us, is apparently right in most of his positions. We speak in this guarded manner because we cannot afford to spend our days and nights in studying Bishop Cozens on vestments, and comparing his book with the various rituals which the law has imposed upon the Established Church. Zanchius and Bishop Horn do not tempt us to this study, nor do the articles of inquiry issued by Laud. Whatever may be proved in this controversy, the Established Church will hardly be made the better, while it would be difficult to make it, in these days, much less acceptable than it now is.

The chief matters at issue at the present time between the higher High-Churchmen and the Evangelicals are raised by the Purchas judgment, which is once more gone over in these pages. Surplice and alb, cope and chasuble, the eastward position, and wafer bread—many high authorities are quoted in favour of their use. The case is fairly stated, as it was before, for Mr. McColl never states a case unfairly. The point is this:—"Is the Purchas judgment a miscarriage of justice or not? The answer to that question ought not to be influenced in the very slightest degree by our opinions as to the intrinsic merits or demerits of Ritualism. If Ritualism can be proved to be a bad thing, there are constitutional ways of putting it down." Exactly, although this is not an expression which we should have expected a High-Churchman to use, much less should we have expected one to suggest such a course. For after dealing with his critics in the manner we have described, Mr. M'Coll gives his opinion as to what would follow from this constitutional way:—

> The Dean of Chester is sanguine enough to "hope" that the High-Church party will accept a compromise, which he is good enough to suggest, and which he thinks offers a reasonable and equitable solution of all difficulties. The compromise is that the High-Church party shall consent to such alteration of the Consecration Rubric as shall make the eastward position henceforward clearly illegal; the Low-Church party agreeing, on their part, to have the eastward position of the altar legalised. Put into plain language, this means that the High-Church party should give up everything on condition that the Low-Church party should magnanimously consent to give up nothing. This is a kind of compromise which I think I may venture to assure my friend the Dean of Chester is not likely to find much favour with the High-Church party. To be quite frank with him, he might just as well attempt to pull the sun out of the firmament as to put down the eastward position. The thing is not to be done. If the dean persuade the Low-Church party and the Broad to unite in support of his tactics he may very possibly succeed in rending the Church of England in twain—a catastrophe of which disestablishment, though one of the most certain, would probably not be the most momentous result. The dean will not be offended if I remind him that he has once already miscalculated the strength of his forces. He did so on the question of the Athanasian Creed. As soon as the agitation against that noble confession of faith assumed a menacing aspect it was encountered by a determined opposition which scattered it like chaff before the wind. I venture to assure my friend that a similar issue awaits his present campaign the moment it aims at any other than a literary victory. For every reason it is better that we should clearly understand each other. The High-Church party has no need to sue, *in forma pauperis*, for toleration and compromise. It has a history and traditions which it has not the smallest intention to abandon at the bidding of any one. It makes no war on others, not even in self-defence, except by the Christian weapons of argument and persuasion. The Dean of Chester and his clients must therefore take their own course. But of one thing they may rest assured. The programme which he has put out is a declaration of war upon the High-Church party along the whole line; and the effect of such tactics will be, or rather has been, to make the entire body of High Churchmen close their ranks and present a united front.

The significance of writing such as this, whatever may be the merits of the questions at issue, is unmistakeable, and we are possibly on the eve of seeing how much it may mean practically. Mr. McColl will probably have his say on the Folkestone case. In that case we suggest to him to show a little less contempt for those who differ from him than he has done in this pamphlet, and at the same time it will not be unreasonable to expect from him a scheme of High-Church action.

*THE HABITATIONS OF MAN.**

M. Viollet-le-Duc is one of the most captivating and informing of writers. He is an exact antiquarian, and one of the most successful of modern French architects; having restored with remarkable genius some of the most venerated fabrics in France. Notre Dame in Paris is the chief of these, and it is said by good judges to be now one of the most perfect structures in Europe. But M. Viollet-le-Duc possesses fancy and imagination also, and he has thrown around the literature of architecture an aroma, a charm, and a poetic grace such as it had not known before. Few could read of the experiments, and the various stages by which that *maison* (whose history he recorded for us in the last volume translated into English by Mr. Bucknall) gradually rose, a model of domestic comfort and beauty—without feeling as deeply interested in it as in most pieces of fiction. The same qualities appear in still stronger force in this present volume. For one thing he has found at once a wider and a more elevated theme—one which yields itself more readily to his peculiarly exact, and yet peculiarly imaginative mode of treatment. It is a point which we have often remarked in M. Viollet-le-Duc's that he views no part or point of construction apart from human association—human comfort or human want—and he thus redeems his art from the coldness with which in other hands it is too apt to be associated.

In the present case he introduces us to two imaginary personages—"Epergos" and "Doxius"—who may be taken to typify respectively the spirit of progress and that of obstinate adherence to traditionary forms and habits. We accompany these two imaginary persons in a series of imaginative tours, in which we see the various efforts, man has made to build himself a house, from the earliest tree-dwellers, in a happy moment drawing the tips of the branches together to form a rude screen, and then advancing to the rough hut, on to the architecture of China, Egypt, Greece, and that of more modern times—Roman, Peruvian, Gothic, Moorish, Norman, Gallic, Renaissance. The manner and style are simply delightful, and the narrative is now and then lightened up with a naïve subdued humour. All we can afford in our short space is to give a few detached extracts as "tasting" of the book. This is an account of an interview with Fau, the Chinaman, who has become rich by industry, retired, built himself a fine house, and, fat, puffing, short-breathed, is dying through his self-indulgence:—

> "Stay," replied the Fau immediately, "you shall see the house at your leisure when you have eaten and drank." Then the attendants brought a vessel filled with a warm beverage, and some spiced cakes.
>
> "This," said Epergos, after tasting of the cakes, "is scarcely fit even for people in health, but would soon bring thee to death. Instead, therefore, of this aromatic beverage, send for some pure water. In order that the remedy we shall give thee to-night may be effectual, it is necessary for thee to abstain all day from anything but clear water."
>
> Fau was scarcely capable of showing his domain to his visitors. The steward of his household was commissioned to conduct them everywhere. . . . The wife and daughter of Fau had come out of their room, and were standing behind the waiter as they returned. He was squatted on mats, his arms resting on a kind of small bamboo trestles artistically walled. Before him was placed a low, wide shelf, covered with fine matting, on which were arranged bowls, bottles of glazed earthenware, and a quantity of small articles unknown to the visitors. In the middle a large open vessel contained steaming rice, with which were mingled pieces of fish. As soon as the strangers had been brought in and seated on mats arranged by the servants, the latter hastened to fill the bowls by means of long ladles. The master, taking two small sticks, which he used with dexterity, despite his obesity, rapidly conveyed the rice to his mouth. Epergos and Doxius had great difficulty in imitating his example, and were obliged to use their fingers to empty the bowls. Next they served each of the party with a warm beverage in delicately thin vessels. Then they brought fish cooked with herbs and roasted birds. But the visitors had satisfied their hunger.
>
> "Now is the time," said Epergos to Fau, "when it will be well to begin the curative process that is to restore thy health. Leave all these viands to thy servants, and let us talk, if it is agreeable to thee. We have admired thy habitation and thy gardens; but when one possesses such an abode he is little disposed to leave it. Dost thou ever go out?"
>
> "How can I?" answered Fau; "I have scarcely strength enough to take a few steps in my garden."
>
> "To-morrow morning at sunrise take twenty steps; thou wilt take thirty the day after by eating but little; forty the day after that, not eating more; and so on for some days in succession; and at the end of twenty days thou wilt be in a condition to take an excursion outside. I saw a boat moored at the portico; well, thou wilt get into a boat and impel thyself, having a servant to help thee when thou art tired. Gradually restore to thy body the habit of exercise and work it has lost; this is the only means of recovering health."
>
> Fau fixed his small black eyes on Epergos. "Is it to mock me that thou hast come to my house?" said he; "thou art then no magician! I am an old fool for having listened to thee. Away with thee! if thou hadst not eaten in my house I would make thee repent of thy impertinence."

Our next extract shall be of a very different character—a sketch of the progress of Rome under Augustus, after the civil wars:—

> During the Republican period Rome had scarcely had any leisure to think of the arts, and of the pleasures and comfort of which they afford the means. At the conclusion of the social war, however, a taste for the arts was diffused among the inhabitants of the victorious city. . . . . The far-sighted policy of Augustus suggested the advantage to be derived from stimulating the growing taste for objects of art, which was manifesting itself among the Roman aristocracy, well aware as he was that the habit of luxury is one of the most effective means of holding the upper classes in vassalage. Therefore, although he lived simply himself, and continued to inhabit a modest dwelling, he looked with favour on those of the patricians, who, in their habitations, affected a luxury till then unknown, who gathered around them artists and poets, and adopted all the refinements of foreign introduction. He who builds himself a palace and adorns it with costly works of art is not a conspirator. To encourage this movement the Emperor had the temples and public edifices rebuilt on a grander scale and with costly materials. This example was followed by all who were desirous of enjoying the favour of the prince; for they know that this was the most advantageous mode of paying their court to him. Not only was the city of Rome changing its appearance and being covered with sumptuous buildings which delighted the gaze and occupied the attention of the multitude, but the country districts witnessed the erection of *villæ*, which contrasted, by their extent and magnificence, with the country houses of the Romans of the Republic; these having been usually characterised by extreme simplicity, as mere centres of farming operations in which luxury had no place. It must be observed, however, that this display of luxury was dictated rather by vanity than by love of art.

As we have already said, the value of this book lies in the fact that it unites a philosophy of human progress and culture with a history of

---

* *My Reviewers Reviewed, in a Preface to the Third and Revised Edition of "Lawlessness, Sacerdotalism, and Ritualism."* By MALCOLM McCOLL, M.A. (J. J. Hayes.)

* *The Habitations of Man in all Ages.* By EUGENE VIOLLET-LE-DUC. Translated by BENJAMIN BUCKNALL, architect. With numerous illustrations. (Sampson Low and Co.)

the constructive faculty in man. The dramatic framework justifies digressions which, being often touched with true humour, add piquancy, as in that sketch of Fau, part of which we have given. It is a book which may be read by the least thoughtful with delight: by the most thoughtful it will be found supremely suggestive and stimulating. Though the translator has not in all cases preserved the felicity of Viollet-le-Duc's phrases, he has given on the whole a very faithful and readable version.

THE MAGAZINES FOR MARCH.

Mrs. Lynn Linton's novel of "Leam Dundas," which bears signs of coming to a conclusion, is carried on with remarkable power in the present number of the *Cornhill*. It is far beyond anything that the authoress has yet written, both for sustained strength, and variety and analysis of character. The article on Assistant Masters is suggested by Dr. Hornby's recent exercise of his absolute power at Eton, and puts the case of the assistants with force and conclusiveness. All lovers of music will read with interest the paper on "La Scala," with its numerous anecdotes of musical composers. There is a want of both discernment and breadth in the paper on "Humour," which the author seems to confound with irony and sarcasm, nor is he more correct in his incidental remarks on Puritanism and humour. He says,—"If Germans are not humorous, it is because they love sentiment too heartily to laugh at it. If the Scotch are not humorous, it is because the Puritan conception of the world realises the solemnity of life and scorns all trifling with its awful realities." Altogether wrong. Is the humour of Burns, Scott, and Wilson not relished by the Scotch? and has not Puritan New England produced some of the finest humorists of the day? Very graphic is the description of the Negro Methodist Conference, which the writer describes as one of "earnest, loving Christians." The article on "Mr. Campbell's Pupils" should be read with sympathetic human interest. The "Hand of Ethelberta" is coming to a climax, although it is perhaps difficult to see what it will be.

The author of the "Dilemma" in *Blackwood* has given us another fresh and unexpected part with a development of plot that no one could have anticipated, although they may have been long looking out for "the dilemma" itself. There is a very competent paper on "Secondary Education in Scotland." We are glad to see the position taken against further public aid, and the wise remark the "the efficiency of intelligence is better than either grants or rates, or any dead mechanism of results." Pleasant and wise also is the writer on "Some Aspects of Friendships." How true this is:—

> The capacity for friendship of a high order implies an unusual power of admiring and respecting, of estimating a character by its great points to the exclusion of small criticisms. Men are drawn to what they admire on that ground alone. If we allow our minds too much liberty of speculation upon character, and amuse ourselves by detecting the weak side, we cannot be friends with it in the grand scale, nor expand into enthusiasm. A fervent admiration quickens the powers of expression, and thus raises the self-estimate. Every true friendship makes a man more alive to what is good in himself, and gives him confidence. Respect even to adoration does not make much way unless it succeeds in conveying some impression of itself to its object. But the ideal friend has this gift of expression, and naturally puts into words the appreciation, the high estimate, the longing for sympathy that possesses him. Liking is of all things most contagious; it is not possible not to have leanings towards one who thinks more highly of you than you feel you deserve; or perhaps finds out what you consider your strong point, to which the world is as yet insensible. In specimen exemplary friendships, men are drawn by reciprocal approval. This capacity for admiration must be cultivated early. It is not often in middle life that people have ardour of temperament, or minds sufficiently at leisure, for new emotions.

Mr. Lyte's book on Eton College finds an appreciative review in a paper on that subject, and capital and humorous is the sketch of "Little Bobby." "Some Gentlemen in the City" is not very favourable to some gentlemen, especially the company-mongers, who are well described, but there is discrimination. The article on "Powers of the Air" will be relished by all Spiritualists. It is candid if not conclusive, but the writer leaves us in no doubt concerning his tendencies. He openly, in the face of what he deems to be credible testimony, "yields it belief." There is nothing remarkable in the "Opening of Parliament."

It is a characteristic effect of the charming way in which Mr. Black treats his heroines that we always wish to be personally introduced to them. That wish was strong respecting Sheila, and it is quite as strong in regard to "Madcap Violet," who, in this month's *Macmillan*, behaves as charmingly as ever. "Natural Religion" is suggestive, but few will agree with everything the writer says, who by-the-bye sometimes reads human nature in a singularly wrong way. We are glad to read the notice of "Virginia and the Gentleman Emigrant." It is more favourable than anything we have read before, but still written with caution. Colonel Chesney has well written of the "War of the Sonderbund."

Mr. Wilkie Collins still further developes the spiritualistic tendency in his characteristic tale of the "Two Destinies" in *Temple Bar*. We are glad to read of the simplicity of character of the "Spanish Poor" in a second article upon that subject, a simplicity very different from that to be found amongst the poor of England. There is a paper on Godwin, where the criticism of Caleb Williams is especially good. Of the old student of Hoxton College, it is said—

> There is much difference of opinion as to the heart of Godwin. Mr. Paul has an amiable weakness towards the subject af his biography, which prevents one feeling entire confidence in him as a guide in these matters. Roscoe and some others did not believe in Godwin having any heart, and his letter to Mrs. Shelley on the death of her child, rebuking her grief, supports that view. But he did so many kind actions throughout his life that we cannot entirely adopt Roscoe's view of the matter. He was certainly of a cold nature, and possessed a sort of Dutch phlegm which must have been at times exceeding irritating.

The powerful tale of Vittoria Contarini is brought to a good close, and there is an article full of information on the development of the railway system. A fresh sketch of the "Fair of St. Nicodème" reads as of another world, and "Her Dearest Foe" is capitally carried on.

In the *Gentleman's* Mr. Buchanan's "Shadow of the Sword" still reminds us of Victor Hugo. What becomes of Anne Boleyn's confession if we are to take Mr. Hepworth Dixon's estimate of that Queen? There is an interesting paper on John Forster, with many new anecdotes. We are glad to read this—

> If I left Mr. Forster's presence deeply impressed with the conviction that he must be some very great man indeed, I was also very sure that he was a kind gentleman. The impression of the boy was correct. Under the grand, blustering, domineering manner there lay a warm and true heart; or Mr. John Forster had not commanded the close friendship of the foremost literary men and artists (among them being some of domineering and irascible spirit) of his day. It is of John Forster in the midst of his literary friendships that I propose to string together some notes; and it is because the stores about him that circulated among his friends generally refer to the majesty or arrogance of his manner that I insist in the beginning on the fine qualities which lay unharmed under it.

The "Prussian Bureaucrat" is good and imaginating, but we are still altogether disappointed in the "Chaplain of Ease." Mr. Cowden Clarke introduces us to more of the old literary society, and Mr. Francillon never wrote better than in this instalment of his tale. The scene between Abel and the Captain is a piece of his best writing.

The *Argosy* has another tale by Johnny Ludlow, but with a decided alteration of spirit and manner. Johnny writes, for once, as an older person would write, and the change is not an improvement. Mrs. Wood's "Edina" is well continued. Very graphic and humorous is "One Day in a Settler's Life," and the anecdote of Meyerbeer in a "meeting," is very dramatically told.

Cassell's Family Magazine has articles informative, articles practical, articles domestic, scientific, literary, educational—articles of nearly all kinds. We commend "Beautiful Hair" (although we altogether disagree with one sentence), "Gardens," "Little Extravagances at the Table," and "Everyday Ailments." In the *Quiver* Miss Beale is surpassing herself in the "Pennant Family," showing a power we had not hitherto believed her to possess. Let us notice, also, Dr. Hannah's "Martyrdom of St. Stephen," and Dr. Spence's "Beauty of Holiness." It is singular that these should be the last words:—"It advances to the promised issue in heaven, when we shall come forth more than conquerors, to be glorified with Christ for ever." So, no doubt, has it been with the writer since he wrote this sentence.

In the *Leisure Hour* there is a good description of the "Green Mountain Boys," and of the Faneuil Hall scene in Miss Browne's tale; an interesting account of the "Rocket Apparatus," and an account of the "Women's Peace Society," written with rightful sympathy. Mr. Wright keeps at Palmyra; and Canon Rawlinson gives some curious information concerning ancient civilisation in Babylon.—The "Woodcutter's Nest" in the *Sunday at Home* is a pleasant tale, and Dr. Stoughton writes well of Westminster Abbey. There is also on original sketch of Dr. Stoughton himself. Mr. Paxton Hood still employs his busy pen on Welsh preachers, and there are two capital tales for the young.

Very finely does Hesba Stretton continue the "Storm of Life" in *Good Words*. Dr. Wynter's "Waste Substances" gives curious information. Professor Blackie has another paper—very suggestive—on the "Natural History of Atheism"; Major. Butler gives a favourable account of South Africa, and besides other papers there is an earnest sermon by the late Charles Kingsley, "Prepare to meet thy God."—The "Bertram Family" in the *Sunday Magazine* strikes us as not being quite so good as some previous tales by the same authoress, but if this seems to us to lack the usual interest, there are other papers which do not lack interest. Of these is Mr. Jones's on the Chinese, Dr. Brown's sketch of "John A'Lasco," and Canon Thorold's on the "Use of Friends." There is also an article on "Richard Cecil," and there are tales.

In the *Day of Rest* we have a continuation of Mr. Macdonald's tale, a fine sermon from Dr. Vaughan, and various other matter, profusely illustrated.

Evening Hours has still another paper by Lady Barker on "Natal," which does not add to the attractions of that country. Is not Mr. Smiles work-out the line of "Self-made Men"? "The Dock Labourer's Wife" is good, and Max Muller's "Recollections" fresh, if singular.

The *Argonaut* has writing of both high character and aim. *Our Own Fireside* would be valuable if only for Mr. Morris's "Thousand-and-One Stories from Nature." *Hardwicke's Science Gossip* is still as remarkable as ever for the value and variety of its scientific information. *Home Words* are cheerful and good. The *American Monthly* is distinguished by good selections from the American magazines. *Hand and Heart* is a new venture. It is a cheap, illustrated penny weekly with new tales. Hesba Stretton is writing a tale which Mr. Plimsoll is delighting in.

Talk of delight, few things can give children more delight than their own magazines. *Little Folks* of this month is admirable, with good tales, well-assorted information, and sufficient fun.

Good Things. This magazine is distinguished by two of the best tales for children, one by Henry Kingsley, the other a history of a bar-out. Mr. W. Gilbert also contributes a fancy tale.

Scribner's Illustrated. Ah! Show it to a little boy or girl, and see what he will ask the paternal relation to do. There are papers this month by Mrs. Oliphant, Miss Alcott, J. G. Whittier, and many others.

Peep Show is good: the best thing in it is the new version of Jack the Giant-killer.

In the *Congregationalist* Mr. Richard, M.P., concludes his charming reminiscences of the late David Thomas, from which we quote a personal notice of John Foster:—

> John Foster was living, and lived for eight years after, and Mr. Thomas was admitted at once into the close intimacy of the great essayist, one proof of which was that he was allowed to penetrate into the sanctum of the study, of which scarcely anyone else had the *entrée*, but with the humorous admonition, as the occupant pointed to the hopeless litter of books and papers scattered in most admired disorder about the room, "Now, Thomas, don't you go and blast abroad what you see here." My friend once took me to Stapleton and introduced me to Mr. Foster. It was my *Vigilium tantum vidi*, the only time I ever saw one for whom I then felt, and still feel, great veneration, as in my opinion the most original and powerful thinker that modern Nonconformity has produced. I recall his figure as he came into the room, clad in a long loose coat, which had once probably done service as an overcoat. He had yet a full shock of hair, only partially turned grey, and apparently not much vexed with brush or comb. His face was long and thin, marked with deep lines, graven there, no doubt, by thought as much as by age. His eye was still full of meaning and observation. Our conversation turned on Mr. Carlyle's writings, of which he did not seem a great admirer, if indeed he had much acquaintance with them beyond heresay and reviews. I had just been reading the little volume on "Chartism," then recently published and creating a considerable stir in the literary and political world, in which the Chelsea seer had been delivering his views on "the condition of England question." Mr. Foster had not seen it, and asked me with considerable interest as to its character. I tried to describe, as well as I could, the eloquent Cassandra wail which Mr. Carlyle had poured over England, full of fierce denunciation, ominous misgiving, and bodeful prophecy of the evils that were coming, unless the country gave timely heed to the voice of warning. "But what are his remedies?" said Mr. Foster. "His remedies are education and emigration," I answered. "Well, the physician's prescriptions are not very original," was the dry rejoinder.

The other contents of the magazine are superior to the average, but we are afraid the reader must be getting wearied with the "Editor on his Travels."

The *Evangelical* has a portrait of Mr. Carlisle, of Southampton, and some fair articles, especially one by Dr. Stoughton on Boston, and another by Mr. Pike. The *Sword and Trowel* has a good sermon by Mr. Spurgeon, and a well-written notice of Gideon Ouseley. The *General Baptist* is distinguished by notices of the late Dr. Burns. We have also the

Cottager and Artisan, Mother's Friend, the *American Pulpit of the Day*, the *Study and the Pulpit*, &c.

Epitome of News.

Her Majesty came to Buckingham Palace on Monday, and held a *levée*.

The Indian Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief left for Allahabad on Monday to meet the Prince of Wales, who is not likely to return to Calcutta.

The Duke of Edinburgh held a *levée* on behalf of the Queen on Wednesday. There were numerous presentations. On Monday His Royal Highness (having obtained leave of absence from the Admiralty) left with the Duchess for Berlin *via* St. Petersburg, where his stay will be very brief. The Duchess will accompany her parents to Livadia in the spring, and proceed from thence to Malta, after a prolonged stay.

Prince Arthur, travelling incognito, arrived at Algiers on Friday in the yacht Vega, and will make a few days' stay. The English residents intend giving brilliant *fetes* in his honour.

It is reported that, as there is such a general consensus of opinion against the title "Empress of India," the Queen, with her respect for public feeling, is not now likely to assume it. There could (says the *Bombay Gazette*) be no better legend for the rupee than the simple words "Victoria Queen," and there is no grander or more glorious title in all history than that of Queen of England. Why, then, change it?

The Empress of Austria arrived in London on the 5th by special train from Dover, and has gone to Northamptonshire, where she has taken a country mansion for the hunting season.

The Princess Charlotte, eldest daughter of the Crown Prince and Princess of Germany, will come to England in a few days for the benefit of her health, and will stay at St. Leonard's.

Lady Augusta Stanley died on Wednesday night at the Deanery, Westminster, after a protracted illness. Her ladyship has never entirely recovered her health since she was attacked by fever at Paris, on her way home from a tour in Switzerland. Her Majesty's solicitude during Lady Augusta's illness was great; twice a day telegrams were sent to the Queen while at Osborne, and twice recently the Queen called personally at the Deanery, accompanied by Princess Beatrice. Lady Augusta was the second daughter of Thomas, seventh Earl of Elgin. She was married to the Very Rev. Dr. Stanley, Dean of Westminster, Dec. 16, 1863. Her remains will be interred on Thursday next in Henry the Seventh's Chapel at Westminster Abbey.

Don Carlos arrived at Folkestone on Saturday, and was received not very courteously by a crowd which had assembled in the town to welcome a delegation from the Municipality of Boulogne to the *fete* at the opening of the new Channel station. A procession of Druids, Oddfellows, and members of other friendly societies, learning who the Prince was, hooted and jeered during the time he remained at the railway station waiting for the London train. At Charing Cross Station a number of persons assembled, who cheered the prince as he was conducted to his carriage. There was, however, a larger crowd outside, who groaned and hissed when the carriage containing Don Carlos drove by, those who cheered or cried "Viva!" being in a decided minority. Don Carlos has taken up his quarters at Brown's Hotel.

General Schenck left London on Friday for Liverpool, on his way to America, to answer the charges made against him in reference to his connection with the Emma Mine.

The marriage of Professor Tyndall to Miss Louisa Claud Hamilton, eldest daughter of Lord and Lady Claud Hamilton, took place on Tuesday in Henry VII.'s Chapel, Westminster Abbey. The marriage was celebrated by Dean Stanley. In addition to the parents of the bride and a few relatives and friends, there were present Professor Huxley, Dr. Hooker, Sir F. Pollock, Mr. Thomas Carlyle, Mr. Spottiswoode, and Mr. Busk.

Lord Lytton (the new Viceroy of India), Lady Lytton, and family, left London on Wednesday afternoon, for Paris, *en route* for India, *via* Naples.

The *Economist*, in a forecast of the Budget, comes to the conclusion that Sir Stafford Northcote is not likely to have a surplus to give away, and that he may be called on to increase the taxes in order to establish a balance between revenue and expenditure.

Mr. Heywood, the owner of the Mistletoe, which was sunk by the Queen's yacht, has been offered the sum of 3,000*l.* by the Admiralty.

The Government propose that a select committee of the House of Commons shall take into consideration the question of the fall of silver.

All the railway companies, it appears, have refused to convey the volunteers at any price on Easter Monday to the proposed review. It has consequently been decided to ask the companies if they would convey the volunteers on the Saturday before Easter.

There are in Birmingham, it is said, 34,497 beershops and public-houses, or one to every 162 persons.

Messrs. Mansfield, of Chelsea, have just successfully cast a statue of Dr. Livingstone, to be erected at Edinburgh. The figure holds a Bible in one hand, and in the other an axe, and is by Miss D. O. Hill.

The site of the old Sadlers Wells Theatre is to be turned into a skating rink and winter garden.

A poor woman has been sentenced at Oswestry to twenty-one days' imprisonment, with hard labour, for stealing a pennyworth of coal. The culprit pleaded hard for mercy on the ground that it was her first offence, but the Rhadamanthine justices were inexorable. There was no clergyman on the bench, as very often happens in such cases; but the prosecutor was the Rev. J. C. Rogers, a local rector.

The Direct United States Cable Company's Torbay, New Hampshire, cable is now repaired, and is in perfect working order. The directors have made arrangements to keep the steamship Faraday on the coast of Nova Scotia, pending the acquisition of a repairing steamer by the company. It is stated that the last break was caused by cutting the cable with an axe or a hatchet.

On Friday the hearing of the case against Richard Banner Oakley, of the Co-operative Credit Bank, charged with obtaining sundry moneys by false pretences, was resumed at the Mansion House. Some further evidence having been given, Mr. Wontner, who prosecuted on behalf of the Treasury, asked for another remand, and said he hoped the case would be completed in two more hearings. The prisoner, who had no legal representative, objected to these frequent remands, which, he said, showed that the prosecution had no case. He applied that, if he were again remanded, he should be admitted to bail. The Lord Mayor declined to accept bail, and adjourned the case until Wednesday next.

Sir James Hannen on Friday, in the Probate and Divorce Division, pronounced a decree *nisi* on a husband's petition for a dissolution of his marriage. The co-respondent was the Rev. John Whewell, for twenty-five years minister at the Congregational Chapel, Vicar-lane, Coventry, who resigned some months ago at the demand of his deacons.

The total amount of the Navy Estimates for 1876-7 is 11,288,872*l.* (including 197,480*l.* for conveyance of troops), against 10,825,194*l.* last year, or a net increase of 463,678*l.* The largest item of increase is 449,992*l.*, under the head of "steam machinery and ships built by contract." The number of officers, men, and boys for whom a vote is asked is 40,400 against 40,600 last. The number of ships and vessels in commission on the 1st of December, 1875, (exclusive of Indian troopships) was 241, against 242 on the 1st of December, 1874. The effective ships for general service are 4 armour-plated line-of-battle ships; 11 armour-plated frigates and corvettes; 31 other vessels of the same class; and 77 sloops and small vessels, of which 11 are sailing vessels; total, 122, against 115 on the 1st of December, 1874.

FUNERAL OF THE LATE DR. SPENCE.

Saturday having been chosen for the funeral of the Rev. James Spence, D.D., a preliminary service took place at Clapton Park Chapel, at 1 o'clock. This chapel which is a large and handsome building connected with the Congregational denomination, was built about five years ago by the congregation of the Old Gravel-pit Chapel, situated in the same district, and intimately associated with the name and career of Dr. Pye-Smith, with a view to the deceased being the minister; but, his health having suddenly failed about that period, he was never able to occupy the pulpit, and was, in fact, compelled finally to relinquish the pastoral office. The deep respect in which his memory was held was evinced on Saturday by the attendance at the chapel of several hundred persons in the busiest part of the day, and also by the presence of Sir Charles Reed, the Rev. Dr. Allon, the Rev. Dr. Aveling, the Rev. De Kewer Williams, the Rev. Llewelyn Bevan, the Rev. Dr. Kennedy, the Rev. Alexander Hannay, the Rev. J. H. Wilson, the Rev. R. Ashton, and many leading inhabitants of the neighbourhood. The pulpit was draped in black, and the coffin placed just below it in front, three or four large wreaths of white flowers resting on the pall. Several relatives of the deceased sat within a short distance. The Rev. Dr. Kennedy commenced the service by reading a selection of verses of Scripture, beginning with the words, "I am the resurrection and the life," and including a large portion of the fifteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians. After this a hymn—the 727th in the New Congregational Hymn Book—which was announced by the minister of the chapel, the Rev. Samuel Hebditch, was sung, beginning "How blest the righteous when he dies." The Rev. Dr. Allon then offered prayer, in which he expressed gratitude to God for the Christian graces which especially marked the character of the deceased, and for the bright example he was enabled to set to other ministers of religion. After this the Rev. Dr. Legge, in a short address, traced some of the leading features in the life of the deceased; alluding to the fact of his almost ancestral connection with Cowie and other founders of Congregationalism in Scotland; and made a touching reference to his compulsory early retirement from the ministry, in consequence of his physical powers having become so enfeebled that his "service" from that time was rather that of those who "stand and wait" than that of an active worker in the ministry, the deceased having, said the speaker, "worn out a constitution never strong by his indefatigable labours." In concluding, Dr. Legge, pointing with much emotion to the bier beneath, said, "Here, in this narrow chamber, lies all that was mortal of an accomplished gentleman, a faithful minister of the Gospel, and a loving friend." After another hymn the Rev. Dr. Aveling closed the service with a prayer and the benediction. While the coffin was being carried from the chapel to the hearse in waiting the organ played "The Dead March" in Saul, the scene at this moment being extremely solemn. About half-an-hour after, at three o'clock, the funeral cortége, which had had about a mile to travel, and included six or seven mourning carriages, arrived at Abney Park Cemetery, where a grave had been prepared close to one in which a brother of the deceased, the Rev. Robert Spence, was buried about six years ago. Here the funeral procession was headed by the Rev. Dr. Allon and the Rev. S. Hebditch, walking abreast, next to whom were the Rev. Dr. Kennedy and the Rev. Dr. Legge, the four sons of the deceased immediately following. Besides the ministers already mentioned there were observed near the grave the Rev. J. C. Harrison and the Rev. I. V. Mummery. Three or four hundred persons had been attracted by sympathetic interest to the spot, which, it may be remarked, is only a short distance from that where the remains of the Rev. Dr. Brock were laid in the autumn of last year. The Rev. S. Hebditch performed the final ceremony of the interment. Beginning with the words, "Man that is born of a woman," &c., which form part of the Burial Office of the Church of England, he proceeded to read a few appropriate verses of Scripture. As the coffin rested on the top of the grave the rev. gentleman delivered, amid profound silence, a short impressive address, at the close of which he solemnly committed the body to the grave with the well-known formula provided for that purpose in the Book of Common Prayer. A prayer followed, in which was introduced the "Collect" in the Prayer Book, beginning, "O merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the resurrection and the life," after which the rev. gentleman used these parting words:—"Now, to our dear friend, we say in faith, and hope, and thankfulness, 'Farewell,'" and then concluded the service with the benediction. Many visitors pressed forward to give a last look into the grave after the coffin, which seemed almost covered by the white flowers before mentioned, had been lowered into it.

On Sunday morning last, the following resolution was unanimously passed by the members of the King's Weigh House Church:—

The Church at the King's Weigh House having heard with sincere sorrow of the death of the Rev. Dr. James Spence, formerly minister of the late neighbouring Church at the Poultry, desires to express to his widow and the other members of the family its sympathy with them in this heavy bereavement. This Church cannot forget the cordial relations which existed between it and Dr. Spence during the time of his ministry in this city, and it will warmly cherish the memory of his consistent Christian character, devout counsels, and fraternal affection. That God may sustain the widow and children in this season of their trial, and that they may have the joy of discovering many after-fruits of their beloved one's ministry, is the earnest prayer of this church.

Gleanings.

On the 10th inst. there will be a partial eclipse of the moon, commencing at 5.21 a.m.

Titles.—The fondness of people for titles is curiously illustrated in the following marriage notice in an Irish newspaper:—"At Rosemary-street Presbyterian Church, Belfast, by, &c., John ——, Esq., G.W.C.T, Ireland; President of the Irish Sacramental Wine Association, member of committee of the Irish Temperance League, and member of the I.O. of Rechabites, to Miss ——, G.W.D.M. of Ireland, hon. sec. of the Belfast Ladies' Temperance Union, and member of the Irish Sacramental Wine Association."

The Prince of Wales and the Camp Chair.—An Indian correspondent relates that the Prince of Wales, who had been dining with Sir Henry and Lady Davies, at Lahore, trusted himself later in the evening to a camp or folding chair, which abruptly collapsed under him. "The fall," says the horrified narrator, "had been so instantaneous, so unexpected, that there was no palliating the shock; it came absolute, unbroken. Sir Henry Davies rose pale and speechless, and gazed over the table at the space where the royal guest had been. It was not till he raised the cloth and peeped under the table that he discovered his prince, unable to move, and positively helpless with laughter." The correspondent believes that "his royal highness still roars at intervals over the catastrophe."

How Many Moons?—We live and learn. We used to think that there was only one moon. But a discussion which has arisen amongst the Episcopalians about Easter proves that there are a great number of moons. We are told that there is an astronomical full moon, a calendar full moon, an ecclesiastical full moon, and how many more it would be unsafe to say. In consequence we are in a muddle, and may, for all we know, be called upon to fast on the wrong Good Friday this year. Everything depends upon which full moon we are to go by. So serious is the case that Convocation is asked to interfere to declare that as Good Friday is a fast of the Church, the Church's moon must be allowed to rule it. It is said that some such declaration is for the future to appear in the Prayer-book. There is an apostolical declaration in regard to moons and fast days to be found in a book which has a much higher authority than the

Book of Common Prayer, which we commend to the perusal of those who are at present so much concerned on the subject.—*Weekly Review.*

THE ARTIST'S MODEL.—An amusing circumstance, showing the use to which artists sometimes put their friends when in want of a model, occurred in connection with one of Sir David Wilkie's most famous pictures. At one period of their career, Wilkie, Jackson, and Haydon were on the most intimate terms, calling in at each other's studios for a chat, and discussing the merits of their works in progress. Upon one occasion, Jackson chanced to look in on Wilkie, who was then engaged upon his celebrated picture, the "Blind Fiddler." "Oh," said Wilkie, "I am glad to see you. I just want a model; sit down, that's a good fellow." Jackson, who was then in the prime of life, complied, and in the result was not a little amused to find Wilkie had used him as a model for a woman in his picture—the grandmother with child upon her lap, next to the fiddler, on the left of the picture. The artist of course avoided making prominent the male characteristic of his sitter's face, but, the lineaments are traceable by those personally acquainted with the features of the original.

DR. DE JONGH'S LIGHT-BROWN COD LIVER OIL.—Invariably pure, uniformly excellent.—Dr. Letheby, late Medical Officer of Health to the City of London, writes:—"In all cases I have found Dr. de Jongh's Cod Liver Oil possessing the same set of properties, among which the presence of cholaic compounds, and of iodine in a state of organic combination, are the most remarkable. It is, I believe, universally acknowledged that this description of Oil has great therapeutic power; and, from my investigations, I have no doubt of its being a pure and unadulterated article. Sold only in capsuled Imperial Half pints, 2s. 6d.; Pints, 4s. 9d.; Quarts, 9s., by all chemists. Sole Consignees, Ansar, Harford, and Co., 77, Strand, London.—[ADVT.]

NEW RAILWAY MAP, *Gratis.*—To meet the desire of the public to procure *"Horniman's Map,"* which shows the various railways, the population of each town according to the last census, and also the Market days, it has been published in a convenient form and will be supplied gratis on application to any of the *"Agents for Horniman's Pure Tea,"* or by post of Messrs. Horniman, Tea Importers, London. 3,248 AGENTS—Chemists, Confectioners, &c., in every town sell HORNIMAN'S PURE TEA, in PACKETS only.—[ADVT.]

THROAT IRRITATION.—The throat and windpipe are especially liable to inflammation, causing soreness and dryness, tickling and irritation, inducing cough and affecting the voice. For these symptoms use glycerine in the form of jujubes. Glycerine, in these agreeable confections, being in proximity to the glands at the moment they are excited by the act of sucking, becomes actively healing. 6d. and 1s. boxes (by post 8 or 15 stamps), and tins, 1s. 6d., labelled, JAMES EPPS and Co., Homœopathic Chemists, 48, Threadneedle Street, and 170, Piccadilly, London.

THE most acute neuralgic pains are relieved by using Bright's Solution. This is the only preparation ever discovered which, by external application, really affords immediate relief from this painful and hitherto obstinate malady. All that is necessary in the simple application of this remedy is merely to dip the camel's-hair brush into the solution and then paint it over that part where the pain predominates. The solution causes neither irritation nor discolouration of the skin; and though powerful and rapid in its action, can be applied by non-professional persons with perfect safety. Sold by all chemists in bottles at 1s. 1½d. Wholesale depôt, 21, Wilson-street, Finsbury.

ASTHMA AND MALADIES OF THE CHEST AND LUNGS—Blade's Anti-Asthmatic Cigarettes, after many careful trials, and found to be safe, efficient, and agreeable, are prescribed at the Brompton and Victoria park Hospitals, and by many other eminent physicians in the United Kingdom, Colonies, and on the Continent. They afford instant relief (however distressing the paroxysms may be), in every case, and in many instances a final cure. Bottles 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s.—Thomas Slade, 118, Long-acre, London, and all Chemists.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY.—This most celebrated and delicious old mellow spirit is the very cream of Irish Whiskies, in quality unrivalled, perfectly pure, and more wholesome than the finest Cognac Brandy. Note the Red Seal, Pink label, and Cork branded "Kinahan's LL Whisky." Wholesale, 20, Great Titchfield-street, Oxford-st., W.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

[A uniform charge of One Shilling (prepaid) is made for announcements under this heading, for which postage-stamps will be received. All such announcements must be authenticated by the name and address of the sender.]

BIRTH.

STEVENS.—March 2, at Norway House, Lostwithiel, the wife of the Rev. E. Stevens, Congregational minister, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

JEFFERY—HICKS.—March 1, at Stoke Green Chapel, Ipswich, by the Rev. W. W. Whale, J. Jeffrey, of the firm of Mustill and Jeffery, cabinet manufacturers, Northampton, to Louie, second daughter of Mr. J. Whitmore Hicks, Hyde-park-corner, Ipswich.

MUDIE—BEDFORD.—March 1, at Bedford Chapel, Oakley-square, N.W., Thomas Ralph, third son of Mr. George Mudie, of Coventry-street and Caversham-road, to Emily Alice, eldest daughter of Mr. Henry Bedford, of 67, Regent-street, and Hill-martin-road, N.

HALDANE—ANDERSON.—March 2, at Regent-square English Presbyterian Church, Robert Camperdown Haldane, of Gleneagles, Ceylon, second son of Robert Haldane, Esq., of Cloanden, Perthshire, to Emily, second daughter of James Anderson, Esq., of Frognall, Hampstead.

DEATH.

GOWARD.—March 4, at Prospect House, Market Harborough, Sarah, eldest daughter of the late T. G. Goward, of that town, aged 52 years.

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS.—Look to your Health.—Any abrupt change in the weather always causes much disordered action in the human body. It is a matter of primary importance to rectify every irregularity without delay, which it is in the power of everyone to do by taking Holloway's Pills. These Pills are the best preventives of indigestion and the mildest aperients ever prescribed. They purify and cool the blood and equalise the circulation through the system, even to the minutest vessels of the skin. They act admirably on the liver and kidneys. By these salutary effects many ailments are averted and more serious illness prevented. Persons subject to bilious attacks, flatulency, gout, rheumatism, and rheumatic gout will be benefited by this treatment.

DYEING AT HOME.—JUDSON'S DYES are most useful and effectual. Ribbons, silks, feathers, scarfs, lace, braid veils, handkerchiefs, clouds, bernouses, Shetland shawls, or any small article of dress can easily be dyed in a few minutes, without soiling the hands. Violet, magenta, crimson, mauve, purple, pink, ponceau, claret, &c., Sixpence per bottle, of chemists and stationers.

A DISHONEST PRACTICE.—For the sake of extra profit some unprincipled tradesmen, when asked for Reckitt's Paris Blue in Squares, substitute inferior kinds in the same form. The Paris Blue, "As used in the Prince of Wales's Laundry," is now so universally esteemed for its splendid quality—above all other blues—that it is important to observe it is only genuine when sold in squares, wrapped up in pink paper bearing I. Reckitt and Sons' name and trade-mark. Refuse all blue which is not so wrapped.

Advertisements.

THE BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY'S ANNUAL RECEIPTS EXCEED FOUR MILLIONS.

HOW TO PURCHASE A HOUSE FOR TWO GUINEAS PER MONTH,

With Immediate Possession and no Rent to pay.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BUILDING SOCIETY, 29 and 30, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane.

HOW to PURCHASE a PLOT of LAND for FIVE SHILLINGS per MONTH,

With Immediate Possession, either for Building or Gardening purposes.—Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK FREEHOLD LAND SOCIETY, 29 and 30, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane.

HOW TO INVEST YOUR MONEY WITH SAFETY.

Apply at the Office of the BIRKBECK BANK, 29 and 30 Southampton buildings, Chancery-lane. All sums under £50 repayable upon demand.

Current Accounts opened, and Interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances. Cheque-books supplied. English and Foreign Stocks and Shares purchased and sold, and Advances made thereon.

Office hours, from 10 to 4; except on Saturdays, when the Bank closes at 2 o'clock. On Mondays the Bank is open until 9 o'clock in the Evening.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars may be had on application

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

THE

NEW

WILLCOX & GIBBS

SILENT

SEWING MACHINE,

WITH

AUTOMATIC TENSION.

AND OTHER IMPORTANT PATENTED IMPROVEMENTS.

THIS NEW MACHINE IS A TRULY

MARVELLOUS IMPROVEMENT in Sewing Machinery. It does away with the LAST OF THE DIFFICULTIES in using the Sewing Machine, while it also RENDERS CERTAIN the doing of

PERFECT SEWING, even by beginners—PERFECT in SECURITY, PERFECT in BEAUTY, PERFECT in DURABILITY. It leaves nothing to the judgment of the operator beyond the choice of the style of work to be done. After that choice,

ALL IS DONE BY THIS NEW SEWING MACHINE, WHICH IS IN EVERY RESPECT THE MOST PERFECT SEWING MACHINE YET MADE. PERFECT IN DESIGN, PERFECT IN CONSTRUCTION, PERFECT IN FINISH. PERFECTLY ADAPTED TO ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF FAMILY SEWING.

A MONTH'S FREE TRIAL AT HOME,

Carriage paid. Price List post free.

BUY ONLY OF THE COMPANY, OR OF AGENTS WHO PRODUCE CERTIFICATES OF AGENCY FOR THE CURRENT YEAR.

WILLCOX & GIBBS SEWING MACHINE CO.

Chief Office for Europe—150, CHEAPSIDE, E.C., West End Branch—135, REGENT STREET, W., } LONDON

MANCHESTER—16, CROSS STREET (ROYAL EXCHANGE)

GLASGOW—113, UNION STREET.

BRIGHTON—32, NEW ROAD (facing NORTH STREET).

CANTERBURY—15, MERCERY LANE.

CERTIFIED AGENTS IN ALL TOWNS.

ECONOMY IN THE GARDEN.

CARTER'S

POPULAR GUINEA COLLECTION OF VEGETABLE SEEDS contains—

pts.	Peas, Carter's First Crop	1 pkt.	Cabbage, Carter's Matchless
1 pt.	„ Advancer	1 „	„ Enfield Market
1 „	„ Carter's Hundredfold	1 „	„ Tom Thumb
1 „	„ Superlative	1 „	„ Savoy
1 „	„ Laxton's Supreme	1 „	Couve Tronchuda
2 pts.	„ Champion of England	1 oz.	Carrot, Early Horn
1 pt.	„ Carter's Victoria	1 „	„ James's Intermediate
1 „	„ Carter's G. F. Wilson	1 „	„ Selected Scarlet
1 „	Beans, Mazagan	1 pkt.	Cauliflower, Carter's Dwarf Mammoth
1 „	„ Improved Windsor	1 „	Celery, Incomparable Dwarf White
1 „	„ Giant Long-pod	1 „	„ Carter's Dwarf Crimson
1 „	„ best French (in 2 sorts)	2 ozs.	Cress, plain
1 „	„ Scarlet Runners	1 „	„ American
1 pkt.	Beet, St. Osyth	1 pkt.	„ Australian
1 „	Kail, Cottagers'	1 „	Cucumber, Carter's Champion
1 „	„ Scotch Curled	1 „	„ Stockwood
1 „	Brussels Sprouts	1 „	Endive, French Curled
1 „	Broccoli, Carter's Summer	1 „	Leek, Ayton Castle
1 „	„ Snow's Winter White	1 pkt.	Lettuce, Carter's Giant White Cos
1 „	„ Adam's Early White	1 „	„ All the Year Round
		4 ozs.	Mustard
		1 pkt.	Melon, Carter's Excelsior
		1 „	Onion, Giant Madeira
		1 „	„ Nasbey Mammoth
		1 „	„ Deptford
		1 oz.	Parsnip, Carter's Maltese
		1 pkt.	Parsley, Champion Moss Curled
		2 ozs.	Radish, Early Short-top
		1 „	„ Mixed Turnip
		2 „	Spinach, Summer
		2 „	„ Winter
		1 „	Turnip, Carter's Six-weeks
		1 „	„ Orange Jelly
		1 „	„ Red American Stone
		1 pkt.	Tomato, Red
		1 „	Vegetable Cream, Moor's
		2 pkts.	Pot Herbs

For full description see CARTER'S ILLUSTRATED VADE MECUM for 1876, the handsomest Seed Catalogue of the year, containing Five Coloured Illustrations and Hundreds of Floral Engravings. Post free, 1s.; gratis to Purchasers.

CARTER'S, the Queen's Seedsmen,

237 & 238, HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON.

STROUD LADIES' COLLEGE, BEECHES GREEN, STROUD, GLOUCESTERSHIRE.
Principals—The Misses HOWARD.
HALF TERM will begin THURSDAY, 9th March.

EDUCATION for YOUNG LADIES, at SOUTHSIDE HOUSE, WESTON-SUPER-MARE.
Principals—Mr. and Mrs. H. B. SMITH and Miss FERRIS.
The course of study is adapted to the standard of the Cambridge Local Examinations, and is under the personal supervision of Mr. H. B. Smith and Miss Ferris, who have had considerable experience in teaching, and have successfully passed Pupils at Cambridge and Oxford Local Examinations.
French taught by a resident Parisian Lady.

LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

Invested Assets on 31st Dec., 1875	£5,441 545
Income for the past year	493,516
Amount paid on Death to December last	10,743,164
Reversionary Bonus allotted for the five years ended 31st December, 1874	662,104
Aggregate Reversionary Bonuses hitherto allotted	5,523,138

The expenses of management (including commissions) are about 4 per cent. on the annual income.
Attention is especially called to the new (revised and reduced) rates of premium recently adopted by the office.
The rates for young lives will be found materially lower than heretofore.
Forms of Proposal, &c., will be sent on application to the Office.

THE LONDON AND GENERAL
PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETY
(Incorporated under the Building Societies Act, 1874.)
Shares, £40. Monthly Subscription, 5s. Entrance Fee, 1s. per Share.
OFFICES: 337, STRAND, W.C.
CHAIRMAN: THOMAS HUGHES, Esq., Q.C.
VICE-PRESIDENTS:
The Right Hon. the Earl of Lichfield. | Frederick Harrison, Esq.
The Hon. H. F. Cowper, M.P. | Vernon Lushington, Esq.
W. Evan Franks, Esq.
Large or Small Sums received on Deposit, Repayable at short notices. Shares may be taken at any time. No back payments. Money ready to be advanced on Freehold or Leasehold Security on reduced terms, viz.:—

Capital and Interest repaid in	10 years	£1	3	7	monthly.
"	12 "		1	0	10 "
"	15 "		0	18	4 "

Managing Director, W. R. SELWAY.

EAGLE INSURANCE COMPANY, 79, Pall-mall. For Lives only. Established 1807.
Reports, Prospectuses, and Forms, may be had at the Office, or from any of the Company's Agents, post free.
GEORGE HUMPHREYS, Actuary and Secretary.

BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA. Incorporated by Royal Charter, 1847.
DRAFTS ISSUED upon Adelaide and the principal towns in South Australia. Bills negotiated and collected. Money received on deposit at agreed rates. Apply at the offices, 54, Old Broad Street, E.C.
WILLIAM PURDY, General Manager.

INVESTMENTS.—The present is a favourable time for Investing in British Lead and Copper Mines.—East Van Shares have recently advanced from £2 to £22, while several others have had a rise of from 50 to 300 per cent. We can recommend two or three Mines presenting favourable features, Shares in which will probably rise from 1 to 500 per cent. within the next few months.
For particulars, apply to Messrs. G. H. BOWYER and CO., Stock, Share, and Mining Brokers, 4, Nicholas-street, Bristol.

ONE MILLION STERLING
Has been paid as
COMPENSATION
FOR
DEATH AND INJURIES
Caused by
ACCIDENTS of ALL KINDS,
By the
RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY,
Hon. A. KINNAIRD, M.P., Chairman.
PAID UP CAPITAL and RESERVE FUND, £180,000.
ANNUAL INCOME, £200,000.
Bonus allowed to Insurers of Five Years' Standing.
Apply to the Clerks at the Railway Stations, the Local Agents, or
64 CORNHILL, and 10, REGENT-STREET, LONDON.
WILLIAM J. VIAN, Secretary.

LONDON and SOUTHWARK FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE. Chairman, HENRY ASTE, Esq.—Chief Office, 73 and 74, King William-street, E.C.

PERPETUAL INVESTMENT BUILDING SOCIETY, 1874.
Established 1851. Incorporated.
Deposits received daily at 3½ per cent., subject to one week's notice for withdrawal.
Paid-up Shares issued daily at 4 per cent. interest payable Half-yearly, and Shares withdrawable at one week.
Subscription Shares payable monthly, quarterly, or yearly.
Advances promptly made upon Houses and Lands.
Agents wanted in unrepresented localities.
JOHN EDWARD TRESIDDER, Secretary.
OFFICES, 16, NEW BRIDGE STREET, LONDON.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTION.—NEW MUSICAL ENTERTAINMENT, by Mr. GEORGE BUCKLAND. Gabriel Grub and the Grim Goblin. Magnificent views and effects. A new Experimental Lecture, by Professor GARDNER, A Holiday Budget of Curious Experiments. Progress of Royalty in India, with new views and effects, by Mr. J. L. KING. Admission to the whole, 1s.; children under 10, half-price.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—ANOTHER Polytechnic Novelty.—The marvellous AERIAL MERCURY; a New Song written by H. EDMONDS, Music by J. A. JOPP, will be sung by G. JOPP, R.A.M., on each occasion of exhibiting this illusion. The Compound Cycloidal Apparatus, producing beautiful patterns, before the visitors. The Geological Piano, or Musical Stones, by M. HONORE BAUDRE. Admission 1s.; children under 10, half-price.

ROYAL POLYTECHNIC.—GRAND DISTRIBUTION of PRESENTS from the Giant Christmas Tree, on Wednesday, January 5th, 12th, and 19th; DUGWAR the Juggler; HERR PROSKAUER'S Drawing Room Magic and all the Polytechnic Novelties. Admission to the whole, 1s.; children under 10, half-price.

MASKELYNE and COOKE.—EGYPTIAN HALL.—Daily at 3 and 8 o'clock. In addition to many novelties the present programme includes Psycho, the world-famed Automaton Whist Player; the Mystic and Oracular Tambourine; and Mr. Maskelyne's most recent sensation of floating in the hall over the heads of the audience, as high as the lofty dome in the centre of the room. This remarkable feat is accomplished while the gas is burning on the stage, and extra lights surround the body as it steadily makes its aerial flight from and to the stage. Admission 5s., 3s., 2s., 1s.—W. Morton, Manager.

ELECTRICITY IS LIFE.
PULVERMACHER'S PATENT
GALVANIC CHAIN-BANDS, BELTS, BATTERIES, RECENTLY IMPROVED.
Approved by the Academy of Medicine of Paris and other Medical Authorities in England and abroad.
HAVE NOW STOOD THE TEST OF THIRTY YEARS' SUCCESSFUL EXPERIENCE.
BY the latest improvements, self-application of these electro-curative appliances has become more convenient, exceedingly comfortable, and most efficacious. The Volta-electric current generated by the present Chain-Bands, though exceeding in quantity that produced by the former Bands, most agreeably imparts to the system a mild but perceptible stream of Electricity of such multifarious healing powers that it may be said to embody a host of remedies in one; most effective, especially, in Nervous exhaustion, Functional Disorders, and many ailments resisting ordinary treatment. The remarkable curative properties of these Bands are widely known, authentically acknowledged, and moreover confirmed by multitudes of patients who, having been restored from a variety of ailments, voluntarily contributed the testimonials contained in the Pamphlet,
"GALVANISM, NATURE'S CHIEF RESTORER OF IMPAIRED VITAL ENERGY,"
Post free for 3 stamps.
This mass of evidence therein is supplemented by the following paragraph recently found in the standard work (p. 76, 1867) of John King, M.D., Clinical Professor of Obstetrics, at Cincinnati:
"These chains are very useful in many Nervous Disorders:

"Muscular Debility	"Aphonia	"Rheumatism "
"Hemiplegia	"Epilepsy	"Dyspepsia "
"Paralysis	"Torpid Liver	"Paralysis (Bladder)"
"Central Paralysis	"Asthma	"Chorea "
"Spinal Paralysis	"Amenorrhœa	"Impotency "
"Neuralgia	"Dysmenorrhœa	"Writer's Cramp "
"Sciatica	"Spinal Irritation	"Hysterical Cramps"
"Stiff Joints	"Nervous Debility	and Contractions"
"Hysteria	"Constipation	"Loss of Smell "
"Hysteric Paralysis	"Deafness (Nervous)	"Loss of Taste, &c."

For further information and price list apply to
J. L. PULVERMACHER'S GALVANIC ESTABLISHMENT, 194, REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

"FOR the BLOOD is the LIFE."—See Deuteronomy, chap. xii., verse 23.
CLARKE'S WORLD-FAMED BLOOD MIXTURE,
The GREAT BLOOD PURIFIER and RESTORER,
For cleansing and clearing the blood from all impurities, cannot be too highly recommended.
For Scrofula, Scurvy, Skin Diseases, and sores of all kinds, it is a never-failing and permanent cure.
It Cures Old Sores,
Cures Ulcerated Sores on the Neck,
Cures Ulcerated Sore Legs,
Cures Blackheads, or Pimples on the Face,
Cures Scurvy Sores,
Cures Cancerous Ulcers,
Cures Blood and Skin Diseases,
Cures Glandular Swellings,
Clears the Blood from all Impure Matter,
From whatever cause arising.
As this Mixture is pleasant to the taste, and warranted free from anything injurious to the most delicate constitution of either sex, the Proprietor solicits sufferers to give it a trial to test its value.
Thousands of Testimonials from all parts.
Sold in bottles, 2s. 6d. each, and in cases containing six times the quantity, 11s. each—sufficient to effect a permanent cure in the great majority of long-standing cases—BY ALL CHEMISTS AND PATENT MEDICINE VENDORS throughout the United Kingdom and the world, or sent to any address on receipt of 30 or 132 stamps by
F. J. CLARKE, Chemist, High-street, Lincoln.
Wholesale—All Patent Medicine Houses.

CHEAPEST IN THE WORLD!
MAGIC LANTERN SLIDES,
Direct from the Maker, on any subject, at the following prices:—
PLAIN, 16s.; COLOURED, 30s. per dozen.
Specimen Slide for 18 and 32 stamps respectively.
Send Stamp for List of nearly 7,000 Views to—
SMYE and CO.,
222, OLD KENT ROAD, LONDON, S.E.

CITY ROYAL PIANOFORTE and HARMONIUM SALOON.—KEITH, PROWSE, and CO., having completed the rebuilding and enlargement of their premises, invite all buyers to inspect their varied STOCK of PIANOFORTES, Harmoniums, and American Organs. Specialities:—New Boudoir Model Pianette, in walnut, full compass, 25 guineas and 27 guineas, the cheapest, strongest, and most elegant pianette yet produced; also their new grand iron oblique, frame of iron, equal in power and richness of tone to a drawing-room grand, price 100 guineas.
City Depot for Mason and Hamlin's American Organs, No. 48, Cheapside, 18 guineas to 150 guineas, and for Alexandre's Gold Medal Harmoniums, 4 guineas to 100 guineas.

FLUTES.—The NEW MODEL FLUTE (old fingering), for beauty and volume of tone unsurpassed, 3½ guineas and 7 guineas. Also Rudall and Co.'s Prize Medal Flutes, new and second-hand. A great variety of Second-hand Flutes of all fingerings, 1 guinea to 25 guineas.—At KEITH, PROWSE, and Co.'s Manufactory, 48, Cheapside.

MUSICAL BOXES by NICOLE FRERES.—KEITH, PROWSE, and Co. direct Importers, offer parties seeking really fine, well-toned instruments, a selection of more than 500 boxes, with all the recent improvements, from £4 to £250. Buyers are requested before purchasing to visit the new saloons, especially devoted to the sale of these enchanting instruments, which for quality have no equal.—Musical Box and Self-acting Instrument Depot, No. 48, Cheapside.—Barrel Pianofortes, 16, 18, and 90 guineas.

BANJOES.—The New Cheapside Model is the best. Machine head, covered back, &c., 5 guineas; other models, 1 to 12 guineas. The new scale for pasting on the fingerboard, 6d., nett. The new Instruction Book, with full directions for learning the Banjo, and a large collection of airs, songs, &c., 6s. nett.—KEITH, PROWSE, and Co., 48, Cheapside. Importers of strings from Italy.

SMOKY CHIMNEYS CURED.
Directions Free.
SEND TO GEORGE HALL,
WORCESTER,
Who will forward particulars.

RHEUMATISM, LUMBAGO, AND CHILBLAINS.
USE THE CELEBRATED EMBROCATION,
DREDGE'S HEAL ALL,
Which affords instant relief.
Prepared only by BARCLAY & SONS, 95, Farringdon-street, London, and sold by Chemists and Druggists.
It is most serviceable for Chilblains before they are broken. Price 1s. 1½d. per bottle.

READE'S
CHEST BALSAM
FOR COUGHS AND COLDS.
This invaluable medicine immediately relieves old or recent Coughs, Colds, Influenza, Hoarseness, Tightness of the Chest, Asthma, Bronchitis, and Pains in the Chest and Lungs. The worst cases are quickly benefited by this remedy, which is pleasant, and does not affect the head as most cough medicines do.
Prepared only by Reade Brothers, Chemists, Wolverhampton, and sold by most chemists, in bottles at 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., and 4s. 6d. each. London agents, Sanger and Sons, 150, Oxford-street, and W. Edwards, Old Change; Manchester, Woolly, Market-street; Liverpool, Chelliew, Lord-street; Birmingham, Southalls, Bull-street; Leeds, Reinardt, Briggate.

The Marvellous Remedy for Coughs, Colds, Hoarseness Asthma, Bronchitis, Consumption, and all Chest Affections.
PECTORINE.
Sold by all Chemists, in bottles, at 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s. each.
Sent by Proprietors upon receipt of Stamps.
From Rev. J. STONEHOUSE, St. Saviour's Vicarage, Nottingham.
August, 1874.
Dear Sir,—I can strongly recommend your Pectorine as an invaluable Cough Remedy. I have given it a fair trial in my own family, and have also supplied it to persons suffering from Cough in my parish, and in every instance it has given immediate relief. In some cases, after passing sleepless nights, one or two doses of the Pectorine have had such a good effect that persons have got a good night's rest, and the Cough has speedily disappeared.
Mr. A. ROLFE, St. Ann's Square, Manchester, Says: "Your Pectorine is superior to any medicine I have ever tried for Coughs or Colds."
PECTORINE cures the worst forms of Coughs and Colds.
PECTORINE cures Hoarseness.
PECTORINE gives immediate relief in Bronchitis.
PECTORINE is the best Medicine for Asthma.
PECTORINE cures Whooping Cough.
PECTORINE will cure a troublesome tickling Cough.
PECTORINE is invaluable in the Early Stages of Consumption
PECTORINE relieves all Affections of the Chest, Lungs, and Throat.
Prepared only by SMITH & CLARKE,
Manufacturing Chemists, Park Street, Lincoln.
*** Vice-Chancellor Sir C. Hall granted a perpetual injunction, with costs, against F. Mason, Chemist, Rotherham, for using the word "Pectorine."

TO EXHIBITORS, ETC.

DISSOLVING VIEW APPARATUS.—Before purchasing see HUGHES'S BI-CYLINDRICAL LANTERNS, fitted with the Silber Light. By Royal Letters patent. A set for £7 7s.

The most ingenious, portable, and exquisite Lanterns out. A great novelty. Universally admired by eminent scientific men. Should be seen.

The Educational Set, 3¼-inch complete, with Dissolver, £4 10s.

A fine Series of over 7,000 Slides, of all parts of the world, Livingstone's Travels, Scripture, Temperance, and other tales. Also, New Lecture Set of the Arctic Expedition, with effects.

Photographs, nicely coloured, 2s. each; Comic Slipping Slides, 1s. 2d.; Levers, 3s. 6d.; Chromatropes, 8s. 6d. All 3-inch.

Buy of the maker, cheapest and best in England. See Testimonials. Illustrated Catalogue, 100 pages, post free, 6d

W. C. HUGHES, Manufacturing Optician, 151, Hoxton-street, N., London.

WATCHES, CHAINS, &c., TRADE CATALOGUE, WITH ENGRAVINGS, Free.

JAMES SIMMONS, 28, Edgbaston Street, Birmingham.

PERRY and Co. (Limited), MANUFACTURERS of STEEL PENS and PATENT EVER-POINTED PENCILS. London Warehouses, 37, Red Lion-square, and 3, Cheapside; Steel Pen Manufactory, 36, Lancaster-street; Pencil Works, 22, Graham-street, Birmingham.

PERRY and Co.'s Best Quality J PENS, 1s. 6d. per gross; Perry and Co.'s Raven Black J Pens, 1s. 6d. per gross; Perry and Co.'s Gilt J Pens, 3s. per gross. These Pens are well known for the soft and easy nature of their writing. Sold by all Stationers.

PERRY and Co.'s UNIVERSAL SCHOOL PENS, for Large, Round, or Small Hand—One Shilling per gross. Superior qualities of School Pens, 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. per gross. These Pens are well worth the attention of all Schools, and they can be ordered through any Stationer.

PERRY and Co.'s PATENT WHEEL SKATES.—We have now the pleasure to state that we can execute orders for these Skates. Price, 10½-inch, 20s.; 9-inch, ladies' size, 18s. per pair. Sold by Cutlers, &c. Wholesale, 37, Red Lion-square, and 3, Cheapside.

PERRY and Co.'s PATENT COPYING INK PENCIL, for Writing and Copying Letters, without the use of Inkstand, Pen, or Copying-Press. 6d. each, or post-free 7d. Box of Leads 6d. each. Sold by Stationers.—Wholesale, 37, Red Lion-square, and 3, Cheapside.

TO THE HEADS OF FAMILIES AND SCHOOLS.

HALF-HOUR BEDROOM CANDLES.

Boxes containing 60 for 1s., or 11s. the doz. boxes. Prevent accidents by fire, limit school pupils and others to the time they sit up, prevent reading in bed. No sparks, or snuffing required.

Sconces suit every candlestick. Metal, 4d.; tin, 2d.

Schools remitting 10s. with order, 12 boxes will be sent, and sconces they require half the price quoted.

WHITMORE and CRADDOCK, 16, Bishopsgate-street, London.

DR. NICHOLS'

FOOD of HEALTH.

Nutritious and Delicious.

For Every Day and Everybody.

Simply invaluable for persons with imperfect digestion.

A perfect Diet for Children.

Price 8d. per lb., in ½lb., 1lb, and 3lb. packets.

Sold by the Sanitary Company (Limited), 429, Oxford-street (opposite Oxford Music Hall); Petty, Wood, and Co., King William-street, City; the Coupon Tea Company, 15A, Wilton-road, Pimlico (facing Victoria Station); and by all respectable Grocers, Chemists, &c.

Wholesale Agents—Franks and Co., 14, Little Tower-street, London.

RELIEF FROM COUGH IN TEN MINUTES.

HAYMAN'S BALSAM OF HOREHOUND

Is the most certain and speedy remedy for all Disorders of the Chest and Lungs. In Asthma and Consumption, Bronchitis, Coughs, Influenza, Difficulty of Breathing, Spitting of Blood, Hooping Cough, Hoarseness, Loss of Voice, &c., this Balsam gives instantaneous relief, and if properly persevered with scarcely ever fails to effect a rapid cure. It has now been tried for many years, has an established reputation, and many thousands have been benefited by its use. It has a most pleasant taste.

IMPORTANT TESTIMONIAL.

Amport Firs, Andover, May 29th, 1869.

Sir,—I have for some years had your Balsam of Horehound for Mrs. B. Webster, and intended writing to tell you how much benefit she has derived. She was considered consumptive, but the Balsam has quite restored, and she is now quite strong. I have recommended you dozens of customers, and all have been pleased with it.—I am, yours, &c.,

Mr. Hayman, Chemist. H. B. WEBSTER.

Mr. Horrex, Chemist, Mildenhall, writes:—"One of my customers says your Balsam is worth sixpence a drop."

IN THE NURSERY

it is invaluable, as children are fond of it and take it eagerly. Immediately it is taken, coughing ceases, restlessness is gone, and refreshing sleep ensues. No lady who has ever tried it would ever afterwards be without it.

Prepared only by A. HAYMAN, Chemist, Neath; and sold by chemists, price 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. per bottle.

WHOLESALE AGENTS.

Sold in London by Prout and Harsant, 229, Strand; Sanger and Son, 150, Oxford-street; Hooper, London Bridge; W. Sutton and Co.; Barclay and Sons, London.

HOOPING COUGH.—Roche's Herbal Embrocation. An Effectual Cure without Internal Medicine.

The salutary effects of this Embrocation are so generally acknowledged, that many of the most eminent of the Faculty now recommend it as the only known safe and perfect cure, without restriction of diet or use of medicine.

Sole Wholesale Agent, Edwards, 38, Old Change. Sold at 4s. per bottle by all Chemists.

Roche's Herbal Embrocation.

ORGAN WORKS.

Established 1837.

Estimates prepared and forwarded with promptitude. Experienced workmen sent to all parts of the kingdom.

Apply—

JOHN BEALE and SONS, Bridgwater.

Or,

F. BEALE, 13, Bute Crescent, Cardiff.

EXCELSIOR GAS BATH, £5 10s. 0d., Eclipse Gas Range, with open fire, registered. Sole maker, G. SHREWSBURY, 59, Old Bailey, E.C. Factory, 98, Barrington-road S.W.

THREE GOLD MEDALS!

BORWICK'S

GOLD MEDAL

BAKING POWDER

Has had the above extraordinary award for its superiority over every other Baking Powder, and is used by thousands for making bread, pastry, puddings, &c., light and wholesome. Sold in 1d. and 2d. packets, and 6d., 1s., 2/6, and 5s. patent boxes, by all Grocers. Schools, families, and hotels should purchase the 2/6 and 5s. size, as there is a considerable saving.

CROSSE & BLACKWELL, Purveyors to the Queen, SOHO-SQUARE, LONDON, direct attention to the following articles of their manufacture, which *always bear their name and address on the labels.*

PURE PICKLES in MALT VINEGAR.

CAPT. WHITE'S ORIENTAL PICKLES, an exquisite compound of sweets and sours.

PURE MALT VINEGAR of uniform strength and flavour, in Imperial pint and quart bottles.

SAUCES for FISH, GAME, &c.

POTTED MEATS and FISH in fancy tins and jars.

MOCK TURTLE, OX-TAIL, HARE, GRAVY, JULIENNE, and MULLIGATAWNY SOUPS.

JAMS, JELLIES, and ORANGE MARMALADE, made from fresh Fruit and with refined Sugar only.

CALVES'-FEET JELLY in bottles, Orange, Lemon, Madeira, and Vanilla flavours.

FLAVOURING ESSENCES, distilled from the fresh Fruits and Spices, Orange, Lemon, Vanilla, Almond, Ginger, Mace, &c., &c.

CROSSE & BLACKWELL'S Genuine Manufactures *always bear their name and address on the labels,* and may be obtained of Grocers, Chemists, and Italian Warehousemen throughout the world.

BREIDENBACH'S MACASSARINE OIL.—A most invaluable preparation for Strengthening, Beautifying, and Preserving the Hair. Price 1s. per Bottle, or three in one, 2s. 6d.

BEAUTIFUL HANDS.

BREIDENBACH'S AMANDINE.

This marvellous preparation produces, in very few applications, a SOFT, WHITE HAND. 2s. 6d. jar, of all chemists, perfumers, and drapers. None genuine unless labelled "Breidenbach Co.'s, 157B, New Bond-street." Sole address.

PEPPER'S QUININE and IRON TONIC Purifies and Enriches the Blood.

PEPPER'S QUININE and IRON TONIC Strengthens the Nerves and Muscular System.

PEPPER'S QUININE and IRON TONIC Promotes Appetite and Improves Digestion.

PEPPER'S QUININE and IRON TONIC in Scrofula, Wasting Diseases, Neuralgia, Sciatica, Indigestion, Flatulence, Weakness of the Chest, and Respiratory Organs, Ague, Fevers of all kinds.

PEPPER'S QUININE and IRON TONIC thoroughly Recruits and Re-establishes the General Bodily Health.

Is sold by Chemists everywhere, in capsuled bottles, 4s. 6d., next size 11s., and in stone jars 22s. each.

DELLAR'S CORN and BUNION PLASTERS. Boxes, 1s. 1½d., and 2s. 9d. each.

The Corn Plasters are a certain cure for hard or soft corns; the Bunion Plasters a proved remedy for bunions and enlarged toe joints. Sold by all Chemists.

CRACROFT'S ARECA NUT TOOTH PASTE.—By using this delicious Aromatic Dentrifice, the enamel of the teeth becomes white, sound, and polished like ivory. It is exceedingly fragrant, and specially useful for removing incrustations of tartar on neglected teeth. Sold by all Chemists. Pots, 1s. and 2s 6d. each. (Get Cracroft's.)

DEAFNESS, NOISES IN THE EARS, &c.—DELLAR'S ESSENCE for DEAFNESS has proved an extraordinary remedy. It always relieves, generally cures, and is strongly recommended by thousands who have derived benefit. It is quite harmless. Sold in bottles, 1s. 1½d., and 2s. 9d. each, by all Chemists.

LOCKYER'S SULPHUR HAIR RESTORER will completely restore in a few days grey hair to its original colour without injury. It effects its object satisfactorily, producing a perfectly natural colour; thoroughly cleanses the head from scurf, and causes the growth of new hair. Sold everywhere by Chemists and Hairdressers in large bottles at 1s. 6d. each.

PEPPER'S WHITE COUGH MIXTURE is the most reliable, speedy, and agreeable Cure for Coughs, Colds, Asthma, Bronchitis, Consumption, and all diseases of the lungs and air passages. Is soothing and comforting in its action, and quite different from ordinary cough remedies. Bottles, 1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. All Chemists.

COAL.—COCKERELL'S COALS.—Best Wallsend, 30s.; Wallsend—Class B, 26s.; Best Inland, 28s.; Inland, Class B, 25s. Best Coke, 16s. Cash on delivery.

Central Office: 13, Cornhill.

COALS.—LEA and CO.'S PRICES.—Hetton or Lambton, 28s.; Wallsend Seconds, 27s.; best Wigan, 27s.; best Silkstone, 27s.; best Stafford, 26s.; new Silkstone, 25s.; Derby Bright, 24s.; Barnsley, 24s.; Kitchen, 22s.; Hartley, 22s.; Cobbles, 21s.; Nuts, 21s.; Steam, 22s.; Coke, 16s. per 12 sacks. Cash. Screened. Depôts, Highbury and Highgate, N.; Kingsland, E.; Beaufoir Wharf, Kingsland-road; Great Northern Railway Stations, King's-cross and Holloway; and South Tottenham, N.; and 4 and 5, Wharves, Regent's Park-basin, N.W.

REMOVING or WAREHOUSING FURNITURE, &c., application should be made to the BEDFORD PANTECHNICON COMPANY (Limited) for their Prospectus. Removals effected by large railway vans. Estimates free. Advances made if required.—Address, Manager, 194, Tottenham-court-road, W.C.

UNPARALLELED SUCCESS OF GOODALL'S WORLD-RENOWNED HOUSEHOLD SPECIALITIES.

GOODALL'S BAKING POWDER, 1d. Packets; 6d., 1s., 1s. 6d., and 2s. Tins. THE BEST IN THE WORLD.

YORKSHIRE RELISH, Bottles, 6d., 1s, and 2s. each. THE MOST DELICIOUS SAUCE in the WORLD.

GOODALL'S QUININE WINE, Bottles, 1s., 1s. 1½d., 2s., and 3s. 3d. each. THE BEST TONIC YET INTRODUCED.

Sold by Grocers, Chemists, Oilmen, &c.

Prepared by GOODALL, BACKHOUSE and CO., Leeds.

DR. HASSALL'S FOOD, for INFANTS, CHILDREN, and INVALIDS.

The BEST and MOST NOURISHING of all INFANTS' and INVALIDS' FOODS, which have hitherto been brought before the Public; it contains EVERY REQUISITE for the full and healthy support and development of the body, and is to a considerable extent SELF-DIGESTIVE. Recommended by the Medical Press and Faculty. Sold by Druggists, Grocers, Oilmen, &c., in Tins, 6d., 1s., 2s., 3s. 6d., 6s., 15s., and 28s. each.

A Treatise by Dr. Arthur Hill Hassall, M.D., on the Alimentation of Infants, Children, and Invalids, can be had post free on application from the Manufacturers,

GOODALL, BACKHOUSE, and CO., Leeds.

SAMUEL BROTHERS, MERCHANT TAILORS, BOYS' OUTFITTERS, &c., 50, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

"ULSTERS."

SAMUEL BROTHERS.

"Ulsters."

The great and growing demand for these substantial and impressive Coats is incontrovertible evidence of their value. They are now ready (or to order) in the utmost variety, and the REAL IRISH FRIEZE ULSTERS (as exhibited by Samuel Brothers at the International Exhibition) can be obtained from no other firm. For wearing qualities these garments are unsurpassed and invaluable during the coming season.

50, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

Overcoats.

The CHESTERFIELD and ALBION OVERCOATS, solely produced by Samuel Brothers, are unsurpassed for comfort, while inimitable in fit and fashionable appearance. For Walking, Riding, Travelling; for Town or Country; for Rain, Cold, or Hard Weather, the NEW OVERCOATS will be found highly serviceable and decidedly conducive to health. They are elegant in style and not oppressive in weight.

50, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

Travelling Suits.

The extreme durability of Samuel Brothers' "WEAR-RESISTING FABRICS," and their imperviousness to the assaults of inclement weather, render these suits most attractive and welcome to all whose business or pleasure leads them to journey long distances. Better protectors against incidental colds or chest complaints need not be desired, as the woollen fabrics are thoroughly warm to the body, without being unnecessarily restrictive.

50, LUDGATE HILL, E.C.

SAMUEL BROTHERS' PRICE LIST.

GENTLEMEN'S SUITS (in Nine Classes).

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
36s.	42s.	50s.	59s.	75s.	81s.	91s.	102s.	110s

GENTLEMEN'S OVERCOATS (in Nine Classes).

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
21s.	28s.	33s.	42s.	50s.	55s.	65s.	70s.	84s.

GENTLEMEN'S "ULSTERS" (in Nine Classes).

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
30s.	42s.	50s	60s.	70s.	75s	84s.	90s.	100s

THE NEW ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF FASHIONS Contains 45 Portraits of Boy Princes of Europe, Eminent Statesmen, and Merchant Princes, illustrating the newest and most gentlemanly styles of costume. Price 6d., or gratis to customers. Patterns and Guides to Self-Measurement post free. SAMUEL BROTHERS, 50, Ludgate-hill, London, E.C.

Harmoniums,

Musical Instruments of all kinds. *Pianofortes,*

On equal terms with any London Firm *American Organs.*

DAWES' PATENT MELODY HARMONIUMS.

(*The best substitute for the Organ.*)

As supplied to Her Majesty and H.R.H. the Princess Louise.

These fine-toned Instruments are now manufactured in Germany. They possess a clear and distinct additional melody in the Treble, also a Sub-Bass or Pedal note in addition to the chords usually played. The Oak Instruments are specially toned and constructed for Places of Worship.

The new Organ Harmoniums (manufactured in Germany) possess a round Diapason quality of tone, the construction also is of the strongest and best materials. Prices from 10 guineas to 90 guineas. A liberal discount made on all instruments to Ministers, Chapels, Schools, &c., by

S. KING, MUSIC DEPOT, ROSS, HEREFORDSHIRE

(Lists Post-free.

To Beautify your Garden,

SEND for my Assortment of Hardy Annuals, 13 large packets, with name and colour on each, including Tom Thumb, Nasturtium, China Aster, Ten-week Stock, &c, post free 14 stamps. Catalogue and Illustrated Almanack included.—G. WISE, Seedsman and Florist, 17, Mile-end-road, London.

MR. COOKE BAINES, SURVEYOR and VALUER, PREPARES and NEGOTIATES COMPENSATION CLAIMS for Property Compulsorily taken for Railways and other Improvements, and also Values property for every purpose.—26, Finsbury-place, Moorgate-street, E.C.

NOTICE.—WILLS' BEST BIRD'S-EYE.

Every Packet of this TOBACCO will in future be lined with tin-foil, thus perfectly preserving its condition and flavour.

W. D. & H. O. WILLS.

January, 1876.

INVALIDS.

DR. ABERCROMBIE'S NEW SOLVENT PROCESS cures Consumption, Asthma, Bronchitis Heart Diseases, Dropsy, Tumours, &c. Names and Addresses of Thousands of extraordinary Cures, also those of many Ministers, added. Inquiry courted. Details of Self-cure, post free, cloth bound, Six Stamps, from 10, Claremont-square, London, N.

Abridged Reviews of the Book:—

The Methodist Recorder says, "Success testified by Ministers," &c., &c.

The Watchman says, "The work will well repay perusal," &c., &c.

The Primitive Methodist says, "The treatment has met with great success."

THE BLOOD PURIFIER.

NO ONE SHOULD BE WITHOUT THE BLOOD PURIFIER.—Old Dr. Jacob Townsend's Sarsaparilla is the great purifier of the blood, it effects the most salutary changes in disease; cures scrofula, scorbutic disorders, chronic sore eyes, rheumatism, piles, liver complaints, erysipelas, all blotches and eruptions of the skin, it removes every impurity of the blood, and all humours and morbid collections of the body, in short, it acts like a charm. In bottles, 2s. 6d., 4s. 0d., 4s. 6d., 7s. 6d., 1 .s. 0d. Pills and Ointment, each in boxes, 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., by post for 15, 36, and 60 stamps, Sold by all Druggists. Chief Depôt, 151, Fleet-street, London. Get the red and blue wrapper with the old Dr.'s head in the centre.

RUPTURES.

BY HER MAJESTY'S ROYAL LETTERS PATENT.

WHITE'S MOC-MAIN PATENT LEVER TRUSS, requiring no steel spring round the body, is recommended for the following peculiarities and advantages:—1st. Facility of application; 2nd. Perfect freedom from liability to chafe or excoriate; 3rd. It may be worn with equal comfort in any position of the body, by night or day; 4th. It admits of every kind of exercise without the slightest inconvenience to the wearer, and is perfectly concealed from observation.

"We do not hesitate to give to this invention our unqualified approbation; and we strenuously advise the use of it to all those who stand in need of that protection, which they cannot so fully, nor with the same comfort, obtain from any other apparatus or truss as from that which we have the highest satisfaction in thus recommending."—*Church and State Gazette.*

Recommended by the following eminent Surgeons:—Sir William Fergusson, Bart., F.R.S., Professor of Surgery in King's College, Surgeon to King's College Hospital, &c.; C. G. Guthrie, Esq., Surgeon to the Royal Westminster Ophthalmic Hospital; W. Bowman, Esq., F.R.S., Assistant-Surgeon to King's College Hospital; T. Callaway, Esq., Senior Assistant-Surgeon to Guy's Hospital; W. Coulson, Esq., F.R.S., Surgeon to the Magdalen Hospital; T. Blizard Curling, Esq., F.R.C.S., Surgeon to the London Hospital; W. J. Fisher, Esq., Surgeon-in-Chief to the Metropolitan Police Force; Aston Key, Esq., Surgeon to Prince Albert; Robert Liston, Esq., F.R.S.; James Luke, Esq., Surgeon to the London Truss Society; Erasmus Wilson, Esq., F.R.S.; and many others.

A Descriptive Circular may be had by post, and the Truss (which cannot fail to fit) can be forwarded by post, on sending the circumference of the body, two inches below the hips, to the Manufacturer.

Mr. WHITE, 228, PICCADILLY, LONDON.

Price of a Single Truss, 16s., 21s., 26s. 6d., and 31s. 6d. Postage, free.

Price of a Double Truss, 31s. 6d., 42s., and 52s 6d Postage, free.

Price of an Umbilical Truss, 42s. and 52s. Postage, free.

Post Office Orders to be made payable to John White, Post Office, Piccadilly.

NEW PATENT

ELASTIC STOCKINGS, KNEE-CAPS, &c.—The material of which these are made is recommended by the Faculty as being peculiarly elastic and compressible, and the best invention for giving efficient and permanent support in all cases of WEAKNESS and swelling of the LEGS, VARICOSE VEINS, SPRAINS, &c. It is porous, light in texture, and inexpensive, and is drawn on like an ordinary stocking. Price 4s. 6d., 7s. 6d., 10s., and 16s. each. Postage, free.

John White, Manufacturer, 228, Piccadilly, London.

WILLIAM TARN AND CO.

CARPETS, CABINET FURNITURE, AND BEDDING.

NEW FABRICS IN CURTAINS AND GENERAL HOUSEHOLD DRAPERY.

The attention of all who are purchasing is requested to the IMMENSE VARIETY THEY ARE NOW SHOWING in these Departments.

They invite Special attention to a Large Parcel of GOOD BRUSSELS at 3s. 6d., and TAPESTRY BRUSSELS at 2s. 2½d.

NEWINGTON CAUSEWAY AND NEW KENT ROAD, S.E.

FREDK. EDWARDS AND SON'S

ECONOMICAL TILED KITCHENERS.

Designed to obviate entirely the objections made to Kitcheners of the ordinary description. These Kitcheners are thoroughly effective and durable. They are very economical; they give no oppressive amount of heat; and they properly ventilate the Kitchen. The Ovens are more equally heated than in the ordinary Kitcheners, and roasting can be done in front of the fire if desired. The various sizes suited to different Establishments, and one in action, may be seen daily at Messrs. EDWARDS and SON'S,

49, GREAT MARLBOROUGH STREET, REGENT STREET, LONDON.

Prospectuses forwarded, per post free, on application.

THE NEW BAPTISMAL GOWN,

Now being generally adopted, is made only by THOMAS BROWN and SON, Church Furniture Manufacturers, 14, Albert-street, Manchester. Drawings sent on application. Candidates' Dresses, Ministers' Waterproof Garments. CHURCH HASSOCKS, CUSHIONS, SEAT MATS, CARPETS, CLUNY TAPESTRY, and other DAMASKS.—T. B. and S. are paying special attention to the furnishing of churches, and invite applications for samples and estimates.

COAL-TAR SOAP.

(Wright's Sapo Carbonis Detergens.)

It purifies, cleanses, and sweetens the skin, taking away all pimples, blotches, and roughness.

By its antiseptic qualities it wards off all infectious diseases, such as Small-pox, Scarlatina, Fevers, &c., and thoroughly purifies the body after an attack, so necessary for the prevention of the graver secondary complications.

Its mild and healthful action makes it particularly useful for children, preventing and curing the many forms of skin diseases to which they are subject.

"It is the only true antiseptic soap."—British Medical Journal.

"In our hands it has been most effective in skin diseases."—The Lancet.

"An unfailing remedy for foul breath and an unpleasant odour from the person."—Medical Times.

IN TABLETS, 6d. and 1s.

W. V. WRIGHT & CO., SOUTHWARK ST., LONDON.

CAUTION.—This is the only Coal-Tar Soap that is recommended by the medical profession. We caution the public against the spurious Coal-Tar Soaps with which the market is flooded.

FOR PUDDINGS, BLANC-MANGE, &c., &c.

BROWN & POLSON'S CORN FLOUR.

HAS TWENTY YEARS' WORLD-WIDE REPUTATION.

EVERY PACKET BEARS THE SIGNATURES,

John Brown *John Polson*

LEA AND PERRINS' WORCESTERSHIRE SAUCE.

In consequence of Spurious Imitations of

LEA & PERRINS' SAUCE,

which are calculated to deceive the Public, LEA & PERRINS have adopted

A NEW LABEL,

bearing their Signature—

Lea & Perrins

which will be placed on every bottle of

Worcestershire Sauce

after this date, and without which none is genuine.

*** *Sold wholesale by the Proprietors, Worcester; Crosse and Blackwell, London; and Export Oilmen generally. Retail, by dealers in Sauces throughout the World.*

November, 1874.

DINNEFORD'S FLUID MAGNESIA.

For over 30 years approved as the best remedy for ACIDITY of the STOMACH, HEARTBURN, HEADACHE, GOUT, and INDIGESTION; and as a safe and gentle aperient for delicate constitutions, ladies, children and infants.

DINNEFORD AND CO.,

172, New Bond-street, London, and all Chemists.

"A STITCH IN TIME SAVES NINE."

BY THE USE OF

KAYE'S WORSDELL'S PILLS

HEALTH MAY BE RESTORED AND PRESERVED

ESTABLISHED 50 YEARS.

SOLD EVERYWHERE.

BRONCHITIS, COUGHS, COLDS, PAINS IN THE CHEST, SHORTNESS OF BREATH, PHLEGM.—DR. LOCOCK'S PULMONIC WAFERS give immediate relief, and nothing else gives such a sound, refreshing night's rest; in rheumatic and nervous pains they act like a charm. Sold by all Druggists at 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s. per box.

H. MULLINER,

COACHBUILDER,

NORTHAMPTON,

Begs to state that the old Carriage Works—established 1760—are still carried on, and that no efforts will be spared to maintain the well-known reputation for style, materials, and workmanship.

DESIGNS AND ESTIMATES FORWARDED AS USUAL.

Customers waited on.

An unusually large selection of CARRIAGES IN STOCK, many good Secondhand ones very cheap.

CROSBY'S BALSAMIC COUGH ELIXIR.

Opiates, Narcotics, and Squills are too often invoked to give relief in Coughs, Colds, and all Pulmonary Diseases. Instead of such fallacious remedies, which yield momentary relief at the expense of enfeebling the digestive organs, and thus increasing that debility which lies at the root of the malady, modern science points to CROSBY'S BALSAMIC COUGH ELIXIR as the true remedy.

DR. ROOKE'S TESTIMONIAL.

Dr. Rooke, Scarborough, author of the "Anti-Lancet," says:—"I have repeatedly observed how very rapidly and invariably it subdued Cough, Pain, and Irritation of the Chest in cases of Pulmonary Consumption, and I can, with the greatest confidence, recommend it as a most valuable adjunct to an otherwise strengthening treatment for this disease."

This medicine, which is free from opium and squills, not only allays the local irritation, but improves digestion and strengthens the constitution. Hence it is used with the most signal success in Asthma, Bronchitis, Consumption, Coughs, Influenza, Night Sweats of Consumption, Quinsy, and all affections of the throat and chest.

Sold in bottles at 1s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s. each, by all respectable chemists, and wholesale by Jas. M. Crosby, Chemist, Scarborough.

*** Invalids should read Crosby's Prize Treatise on "Diseases of the Lungs and Air Vessels," a copy of which can be had gratis of all Chemists.

DR. ROOKE'S ORIENTAL PILLS AND SOLAR ELIXIR.

These well-known family medicines have had a continually-increasing sale throughout the United Kingdom and the British Colonies since their first introduction in 1836, and are especially noted for their strengthening and restorative properties. Hence their invariable success in the relief and cure of Indigestion, Liver Complaints, Asthma and Bronchitis, Pulmonary Consumption, Rheumatism, Gout, Scrofula, General Debility, and all Diseases of the Nervous System, whether arising from sedentary mode of life, unhealthy occupation, insalubrious climate, or other cause whatsoever.

The Oriental Pills are sold in boxes at 1s. 1½d. and 4s. 6d. each. The Solar Elixir in bottles at 4s. 6d. and 11s. each. Both to be obtained of all Chemists

"DR. ROOKE'S ANTI-LANCET."

All who wish to preserve health and thus prolong life should read Dr. Rooke's "Anti-Lancet," or "Handy Guide to Domestic Medicine," which can be had gratis from any chemist, or post free from Dr. Rooke, Scarborough. Concerning this book, the late eminent author Sheridan Knowles observed:—"It will be an incalculable boon to every person who can read and think."

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE WITH **THE BEST ARTICLES**
AT
ESTABLISHED **DEANE'S.** A.D. 1700.

ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE, WITH PRICED FURNISHING LISTS, GRATIS AND POST FREE.

TABLE KNIVES, IVORY, per doz., from 19s. to 55s.
ELECTRO FORKS—Table, 24s. to 38s.; Dessert, 18s. to 29s.
„ SPOONS „ 24s. to 40s.; „ 16s. to 30s.
PAPIER MACHE TEA TRAYS in Sets, 21s., 56s., 95s.
ELECTRO TEA AND COFFEE SETS, from £3 7s. to £24.
DISH COVERS—Tin, 23s.; Metal, 65s.; Electro, £11 11s.
ELECTRO CRUETS, from 12s. 6d. to £6 6s.
„ LIQUEURS from 40s. to £6 10s.
LAMPS—Patent Rock Oil, Moderator, &c.
BRONZED TEA AND COFFEE URNS.
COAL-SCUTTLES AND VASES, BOXES, &c.
CLOCKS—English, French, and American.
CHINA AND GLASS—Dinner, Tea, and Dessert Services.

FENDERS—Bright, 45s. to £15; Bronze, 3s. to £6.
STOVES—Bright, Black, Register, Hot-air, &c.
BATHS—Domestic, Fixed, and Travelling.
BEDSTEADS—Brass and Iron, with Bedding.
CORNICES—Cornice-poles, Ends, Bands, &c.
GASELIERS—2-light, 17s.; 3-do., 52s.; 5-do., £6 6s.
„ Glass, 3-light, 55s.; 5-light, £6.
KITCHENERS—From 3 ft., £3 5s., to 6 ft., £33.
KITCHEN UTENSILS—Copper, Tin, and Iron.
TURNERY GOODS, BRUSHES, MATS, &c.
TOOLS—Gentlemen's Chests, Household, Youths, &c.
GARDEN TOOLS—Lawn Mowers, Rollers, Hurdles, &c.
HOT-WATER FITTINGS for Greenhouses, Halls, &c.

A Discount of 5 per cent. for cash payments of £2 and upwards.

DEANE & CO. (46, King William Street), LONDON BRIDGE.

"A most delicious and valuable article."—*Standard.*

FRY'S CARACAS COCOA

owes its delicious flavour to the choice Caracas and other Cocoas with which it is manufactured.

NINE EXHIBITION MEDALS AWARDED TO J. S. FRY AND SONS.

NESTLÉ'S MILK FOOD FOR INFANTS,

PREPARED AT VEVEY, SWITZERLAND.

LONDON DEPOT, 3, BARBICAN, E.C.

The basis of HENRI NESTLÉ'S MILK FOOD is the choicest milk of Swiss cows, which is obtained from the largest dairies surrounding Vevey. The milk is dried in a particular way, which preserves its original valuable properties unchanged. Its preparation for use is simple and easy at all times, requiring only to be mixed with water; in this respect differing from most other foods, which generally need the addition of milk and sugar. It is, therefore, not only a good, but also a cheap food.

NESTLÉ'S MILK FOOD, which is in the form of a fine powder, is highly recommended by the highest medical authorities, as the best substitute for human milk. It is very nutritious, agreeable, and easily digested, and is the best food for the earliest periods of infancy. It keeps infants healthy, and it can be retained on the stomach when all other foods are rejected. This food has also proved itself highly beneficial for invalids.

NESTLÉ'S MILK FOOD was rewarded with a Medal and Diploma of Honour at the Marseilles Exhibition, and also at the Paris Exhibition of 1874. The sale for last year in France and Germany was OVER A MILLION BOXES. Every box bears the signature of HENRI NESTLÉ, without which none is genuine.

SOLD BY ALL CHEMISTS AND DRUGGISTS, AT 2s. PER BOX.

THE IMPROVED

"Premier" Patent School Desk.

SOLE MAKER TO THE LEEDS, MANCHESTER, BRADFORD, HALIFAX,
AND VARIOUS OTHER SCHOOL BOARDS.

T. RICHARDSON, PIMBLETTT STREET, PARK STREET, MANCHESTER.
Drawings and Price Lists on application.

J. & P. COATS'

SEWING

COTTON.

BEST SOFT 6-CORD SEWING COTTON.
SUITABLE FOR ALL SEWING MACHINES.

EXTRA GLACÉ COTTON.
This Cotton being greatly improved in quality and finish, will be found unsurpassed for Machine or Hand Sewing.

On Reels, 100, 200, or 500 Yards.

CROCHET OR TATTING COTTON,
Unsurpassed in Quality.

To be had of all Wholesale and Retail Drapers throughout the United Kingdom.

DR. J. COLLIS BROWNE'S CHLORODYNE.

THE ORIGINAL AND ONLY GENUINE.

CHLORODYNE is admitted by the Profession to be the most wonderful and valuable remedy ever discovered.
CHLORODYNE is the best remedy known for Coughs, Consumption, Bronchitis, Asthma.
CHLORODNYE effectually checks and arrests those too-often fatal diseases—Diphtheria, Fever, Croup, Ague.
CHLORODYNE acts like a charm in Diarrhœa, and is the only specific in Cholera and Dysentery.
CHLORODYNE effectually cuts short all attacks of Epilepsy, Hysteria, Palpitation, and Spasms.
CHLORODYNE is the only palliative in Neuralgia, Rheumatism, Gout, Cancer, Toothache, Meningitis, &c.

From Lord FRANCIS CONYNGHAM, Mount Charles, Donegal, 11th December, 1868.

"Lord Francis Conyngham, who this time last year bought some of Dr. J. Collis Browne's Chlorodyne from Mr. Davenport, and has found it a most wonderful medicine, will be glad to have half-a-dozen bottles sent at once to the above address."

"Earl Russell communicated to the College of Physicians that he received a despatch from Her Majesty's Consul at Manilla, to the effect that Cholera has been raging fearfully, and that the ONLY remedy of any service was CHLORODYNE."—See Lancet, 1st December, 1864.

CAUTION.—BEWARE OF PIRACY AND IMITATIONS.

CAUTION.—Vice-Chancellor Sir W. PAGE WOOD stated that Dr. J. COLLIS BROWNE was, undoubtedly, the Inventor of CHLORODYNE; that the story of the defendant, FREEMAN, was deliberately untrue, which, he regretted to say, had been sworn to.—See Times, 13th July, 1864.

Sold in bottles at 1s. 1½d., 2s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 11s. each. None is genuine without the words "Dr. J. COLLIS BROWNE'S CHLORODYNE" on the Government stamp. Overwhelming Medical Testimony accompanies each bottle.

SOLE MANUFACTURER—J. T. DAVENPORT, 33, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury, London.

JNO. GOSNELL & CO.'S

CHERRY TOOTH PASTE

is greatly superior to any Tooth Powder, gives the Teeth a Pearl-like Whiteness protects the enamel from decay, and imparts a pleasing Fragrance to the Breath. Price 1s. 6d. per pot.

Sold by all Chemists and Perfumers, and at ANGEL PASSAGE, 93, UPPER THAMES ST., LONDON, E.C.

EDUCATIONAL WORKS.
By Dr. WILLIAM DAVIS, B.A.

1. The BOOK of POETRY, for Schools and Families. Containing a large number of Choice Extracts from our Poets; together with Brief Notes of the Life and Principal Works of each Writer. Fcap. 8vo, 192 pp. cloth, 1s.
2. The COMPLETE ENGLISH SPELLING and DICTATION BOOK. Containing carefully-graduated Spelling Lessons, with very copious Dictation Exercises. Fcap. 8vo, 156 pp. cloth, 1s. 6d.
3. The COMPLETE BOOK of ARITHMETICAL EXAMPLES. Fcap. 8vo, 180 pp. cloth, 1s. 4d.—KEY, 2s.—The EXAMPLES and KEY together, 3s.
4. ARITHMETICAL EXAMPLES. In Two Parts. Cloth, 8d. each.
5. The JUNIOR ARITHMETIC. Containing Explanations, Exercises, and the Answers to all the Questions. 6d.
6. The MEMORY WORK of ARITHMETIC: a Complete Compendium of Tables, Definitions, and Rules. 4d.
7. The FIRST SIX BOOKS of EUCLID. Cloth, 1s.

Just published,

8. The COMPLETE GRADE SPELLING BOOK. Containing most of the Easy and Difficult Words in the English Language, arranged in Lessons for Home Work. Price 8d.; or in Three Parts, 3d. each.

*** A Specimen Copy of any of the above sent for half the price in stamps, on application to Dr. Davis, Wellington Park, Clifton, Bristol.

London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.; and through all Booksellers.

J. PRIDHAM'S POPULAR MUSIC for the PIANOFORTE—Descriptive Fantasia founded on Favourite Airs:—

The Soldier's Dream, 4s.
The Shah's March, 4s.
The Sailor's Dream, 4s.
The Rose (English airs), 3s.
The Thistle (Scotch airs), 3s.
And the Russian Fantasia, 3s.
The Soldier's Farewell, 4s.
The Soldier's Return, 4s.
The Shamrock (Irish airs), 3s.
The Chase, 4s.
The Humming Bird, 3s.

All at half price; post free in stamps.

WILLIAM SMALLWOOD'S POPULAR MUSIC for the PIANOFORTE, carefully fingered:—

Home Treasures, 25 Numbers. 2s 6d. each.
Sacred Treasures, 12 Books. 2s. 6d. each.
Little Buds, 25 Themes. 1s. each.
Home Classics, 12 Books. 2s. 6d. each.
Handel's March from "Scipio," 3s.
Home Treasures, as Piano Duets, 12 Numbers. 3s. each.

All post free at half price in stamps.

HALF-HOURS with the ORATORIOS, and other Sacred Compositions. Arranged for the Pianoforte by GEORGE FREDERICK WEST. In Three Books, each 4s. This choice selection has originated in a frequent demand for good extracts suitable for Sunday playing in the domestic circle. Post free for 24 stamps each.

OPERATIC LEAFLETS for the YOUNG. Arranged and fingered for the Pianoforte by GEORGE FREDERICK WEST. Twenty-five numbers, 2s. 6d. each free by post at half price in stamps. The above are arranged expressly for educational purposes, and are intended to follow the instruction book.

Sole publishers, Robert Cocks and Co., New Burlington-street. Order everywhere.

CATHOLIC SERMONS, Vols. I. and II.; Select Discourses by Eminent Ministers of various Denominations. Revised by the Authors. Toned paper, extra cloth, gilt, price 2s. 6d. each.

DR. PUNSHON'S LECTURES and SERMONS. Author's Second Edition. Thick paper, elegantly bound in morocco, gilt edges, with steel Portrait, price 12s. 6d.

PULPIT ECHOES.—Select Sermons by Eminent Ministers of all Denominations, revised by the authors. The Volume for 1876 is now ready, containing Sermons by Rev. M. Punshon, LL.D.; Rev. James Spence, D.D.; Rev. G. W. McCree; Rev. Thomas McCullagh; Rev. Thomas T. Lambert; Rev. J. O. Dykes, D.D.; Rev. S. Minton, M.A.; Rev. A. Mursell; Very Rev. Dean Stanley; Rev. S. Cooke; Rev. N. Hall; Rev. T. Binney; with a life-like Portrait of Dean Stanley as Frontispiece. Demy 8vo, thick paper, elegantly bound, cloth gilt, Half-a-Crown.

F. E. Longley, 39, Warwick-lane, E.C.

Just published, price 2d.,

THOUGHTS on the REMOTER SOURCES of MODERN UNBELIEF. By W. T. NICHOLSON, B.A., Vicar of St. Benedict's, Norwich.

"Brief but striking tract."—W. E. Gladstone.
"An incentive to further thought on a subject of supreme importance."—Norfolk News.

W. H. Guest, 29, Paternoster-row.

Now ready, crown 8vo, cloth bound, Eight Plates, price 5s.

NEW AND ORIGINAL ILLUSTRATED WORK ON OVARIAN DROPSY and ASCITES: their Diagnosis and Treatment. Also on Prolapsus of the Uterus. By RICHARD EPPS, M.D. (Cl.), M.R.C.S.

London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co., Paternoster Row.

GENTLEMEN desirous of having their Linens dressed to perfection should supply their Laundresses with the

"GLENFIELD STARCH,"

Which imparts a brilliancy and elasticity gratifying to the wearer.

TOWLE'S CHLORODYNE, renowned for giving immediate relief in Coughs, Consumption, Asthma, Bronchitis, Diarrhœa, Cholera, &c. Price 1s 1½d., 2s. 9d., and 4s. 6d. A Surgeon writes—"I have found Towle's Chlorodyne to relieve more pain and cause more joy than any other medicine." Also, TOWLE'S CHLORODYNE JUJUBES and LOZENGES. Towle, 75, Bk. Piccadilly, Manchester 1s. Packet per Post.

DR. FARRAR'S "LIFE OF CHRIST."

In Two Volumes, cloth, price 24s.; calf antique, £2 2s.

THE LIFE of CHRIST. By the Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Master of Marlborough College, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

"The great value of the book consists in the connected view it presents of the tragedy of the Gospels, and the facility it affords to all classes, learned or unlearned, of acquainting themselves readily with the main features of any scene to which they may turn, each occurrence being presented with completeness and with grace of narration; and it will acquaint them with fresh sources of information and new aspects of familiar events."—Times.

"Handsome in its production, valuable and instructive in its contents, it is just the book many will feel thankful to us for suggesting as a gift to a friend."—Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.

"Sincere, candid, learned, eloquent, devout, Dr. Farrar has produced a book fitted alike for the general reader and for the scholar—a book which throws a flood of light upon the Gospel narrative. I make this special reference to Dr. Farrar's volumes here because I can conceive few more appropriate gifts at this season, and because I think that those of my readers who take the hint will feel thankful to me that I gave it."—Western Morning News.

CASSELL, PETTER, AND GALPIN; and all Booksellers.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.

NEW AND CHOICE BOOKS.

BOXES AND PARCELS OF THE BEST AND NEWEST BOOKS

ARE FORWARDED DAILY FROM

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY

TO

FAMILIES AND BOOK SOCIETIES IN ALL PARTS OF THE COUNTRY.

REVISED LISTS of the PRINCIPAL BOOKS in CIRCULATION or on SALE are now ready and will be forwarded, postage free, on application.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY (Limited),
NEW OXFORD STREET.

JAMES NISBET AND CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

This day is published, No. 2, March, 1876, price 2d.,

THE HARBINGER of DAWN. Edited by the Author of "English Hearts and English Hands."

CONTENTS.—Friends—They shall see His Face—For an Invalid—Egypt—Watchman, What of the Night?—Another Link—Village Sketches, Part II.—The Christmas Gift—The Eleventh Hour—Not too late—Bible Readings at Home—In the Day's Plan—The Unconscious Guide—A Highland Valley—Personal Ministries—Notices of Books—Lines on the Words in the Communion Service—Sketch of the Childhood of Francis Mackenzie, Part II.

Crown 8vo, 5s., cloth,

CONVERSATIONS on the GOSPEL according to ST. LUKE. By EMILY TEMPLE FREER.

Crown 8vo, 5s, cloth,

THE HEIR of the WORLD; or, the Nations of Europe as descended from Abraham.

MISS WARNER'S NEW WORK.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d., cloth,

WYCH HAZEL: a Tale. By the Author of "The Wide, Wide World," &c. A Tale for Girls, not for Critics.

Post 8vo, 6s., cloth,

SYNOPTICAL LECTURES on the BOOKS of HOLY SCRIPTURE. By the Rev. D. FRASER, D.D. Third Series, completing the Work.

Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d., cloth; 3s, gilt edges,

THE GOSPEL and its MINISTRY. By R. ANDERSON, LL.D.

Second Edition, 4to, 21s., cloth,

WILD FLOWERS of the HOLY LAND: Fifty-four Plates Printed in Colours. Drawn and Painted after Nature by HANNA ZELLER, Nazareth. With a Preface by the Rev. H. B. TRISTRAM, Canon of Durham, and an Introduction by EDWARD ATKINSON, Esq, F.L.S., F.Z.S.

"The representations of the native flora of Galilee are exquisite."—Morning Post.

Crown 8vo, 2s., cloth,

LILIES OR THISTLEDOWN. By JULIA MATTHEWS, Author of "Dare to Do Right."

Second Thousand, crown 8vo, 5s., cloth; Fourth Thousand royal 32mo, 1s. 6d., cloth, gilt edges,

UNDER the SURFACE: Poems. By FRANCES R. HAVERGAL, Author of "Morning Bells and Little Pillows," &c., &c.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d., cloth,

SEEKING THE LOST: Incident and Sketches of Christian Work in London. By the Rev. C. J. W. WHITMORE, Author of "The Bible in the Workshop."

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d., cloth,

FOUNDATION TRUTHS: Lectures on Romans viii. 33, 34. preached in Portman Chapel during Lent, 1875. By the Rev. J. W. REEVE, M.A., Canon of Bristol, Author of "The Titles of Jehovah," &c.

Second Edition, post 8vo, 7s. 6d., cloth,

TWELVE MONTHS in MADAGASCAR. By the Rev. J. MULLENS, D.D., Foreign Secretary of the London Missionary Society. With Illustrations.

London: James Nisbet and Co., 21, Berners-street, W.

PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Chief Offices: 62, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

SUMMARY OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT,

For the Year ending 31st December, 1875.

ORDINARY BRANCH.

During the year the Directors have received 3,429 Proposals, for the sum of £451,235. Of these, 2,675 have been accepted and completed, assuring the sum of £348,364, and producing a New Annual Premium Income of £11,587 11s. 1d; 754 Proposals, for Assurances of £102,871, have either been declined or not completed.

The sum of £1,288 15s. 8d. has been received for New Annuities granted.

The Claims amount to £49,501 15s. 4d., under 337 Policies; £977 16s. of this amount was for claims on Endowments matured. The number of deaths was 308.

Twelve Annuitants have died during the year.

The Annual Premium Income at the end of the year is £76,355 7s. 8d. in respect of 15,889 Policies, assuring the sum of £2,360,180, showing an increase of £4,508 2s. 8d. per annum over the year 1874.

INDUSTRIAL BRANCH.

During the year 1,167,292 New Policies were issued, representing a New Annual Premium Income of £141,222 12s.

The Claims amount to £217,415 18s. 3d.

The Annual Premium Income at the close of the year is £794,052 15s. 8d., showing an increase of £178,411 11s. 4d. over the income of the previous year.

GENERAL RESULTS.

The total Premium Income is £870,408 3s. 4d., being an increase of £182,919 14s. over the past year.

The Claims amount to £266,917 13s. 7d., raising the total sum to £1,597,213 12s.

The Assurance Fund is £702,184 13s. 6d., showing an increase of £128,660 10s. 7d. for the year.

The staff of the Office has already been engaged for many months in preparing for the Quinquennial Valuation, which is to take place at the end of 1876, and which, from the nature and extent of the business transacted by the Company, will involve a number of computations unparalleled in the history of Life Assurance.

The Directors regret to announce that Mr. GEORGE CLARK, one of the Auditors, who had been connected with the Company from a very early period of its existence, died soon after the last Annual Meeting. Under the powers vested in them, the Directors have appointed one of the oldest shareholders, Dr. ROBERT BARNES, who, with Mr. ALLANSON, has audited the accounts for the year.

BALANCE SHEET OF THE PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY, on the 31st December, 1875.

LIABILITIES.

	£	s.	d.
Shareholders' Capital	10,052	0	0
Life Assurance Fund	702,184	13	6
Sickness and Assurance Fund	817	7	4
Contingency Fund, created at Annual Meeting, April, 1872	16,093	0	0
Guarantee Fund	15,000	0	0
Leasehold Redemption Fund	1,500	0	0
	£745,650	0	10
Claims under Life Policies admitted but not yet paid	7,802	18	4
	£753,452	19	2

ASSETS.

	£	s.	d.
Mortgages on Property within the United Kingdom	77,451	2	4
Loans on the Company's Policies	17,024	13	11
Investments:—			
In British Government Securities	27,855	1	5
Indian and Colonial ditto	55,628	7	1
Foreign ditto	16,567	15	3
Railway and other Debentures and Debenture Stock	48,539	10	0
Railway Shares (Preference and Ordinary)	6,750	0	0
Trust Fund Certificates	30,013	10	0
Freehold Ground Rents	57,284	0	4
House Property	90,536	18	3
Life and other Interests and Reversions	94,537	6	5
Furniture and Fittings (Head and Branch Offices)	10,870	4	10
Loans upon Personal Security	29,726	18	7
Loans on Borough Rates	8,820	0	0
Mortgage of Reversions	6,175	2	3
Equitable Mortgage of Freehold Property	8,000	0	0
Agent's Balances	41,215	17	3
Outstanding Premiums	5,636	2	4
Ditto Interest	4,466	17	1
Ditto Rents	645	8	9
Amount due from Official Liquidator of International Society	31,789	18	9
Deposits at Three Months' notice	35,000	0	0
Cash—On Deposit £31,000 0 0			
In hand and on current account 17,918 4 4	48,918	4	4
	£753,452	19	2

J. GILLMAN, Chairman,
EDGAR HORNE,
R. T. PUGH, } Directors.

We have examined the foregoing Accounts, find them to be correct, and hereby confirm the same. We have also seen and examined the various securities.

JAMES ALLANSON,
ROBERT BARNES, } Auditors.

HENRY HARBEN, Resident Director.
W. J. LANCASTER, Secretary.

15th February, 1876.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — PRICE FROM £5 5s. — LESS 5% DISCOUNT FOR CASH.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — ON HIRE AT 2s. 6d. PER WEEK. — TO WORK BY HAND OR TREADLE.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — ON HIRE AT 2s. 6d. PER WEEK. — IN PORTABLE CASE FOR TRAVELLING.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — PRICE FROM £5 5s. — ON HIRE AT 2/6 PER WEEK.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — PRICE FROM £5 5s. — ON HIRE AT TERMS WITHIN THE REACH OF ALL.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — PRICE FROM £5 5s. — ON HIRE WITH OPTION OF PURCHASE WITHOUT EXTRA COST.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — PRICE FROM £5 5s. — ON HIRE. May be returned or purchased at any time, or purchased by continuing the hire.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — PRICE FROM £5 5s. — CAUTION. BEWARE OF COUNTERFEITS offered under the pretext of being "on SINGER principle."

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — PRICE FROM £5 5s. — The only "SINGER" Machines are machines made by the Singer Manufacturing Company.

SEE THAT OUR NAME *SINGER* Is on the arm of the Machine and also on the Brass Trade-Mark Plate.

SINGER SEWING MACHINES — PRICE FROM £5 5s. — To avoid deception, buy only at the Company's Depots or of Agents holding the Company's certificate.

THE SINGER MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

CHIEF OFFICE IN EUROPE,
39, FOSTER LANE, CHEAPSIDE,
LONDON, E.C.

LONDON DISTRICT OFFICES.

147, CHEAPSIDE, E.C.
132, OXFORD STREET, W.
33, NEWINGTON CAUSEWAY, S.E.
144, BROMPTON ROAD, S.W.
12, COMMERCIAL RD., E.
8, CASTLE ST., KINGSLAND HIGH ST., N.
131, SOUTH ST., GREENWICH, S.E.
141, HIGH ST., CROYDON, S.E.
1, CLARENCE STREET, KINGSTON, S.W.,

AND 95 OTHER BRANCHES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Published by W. R. WILLCOX, at No. 18, Bouverie Street, London; and Printed by R. K. BURT and Co., Wine Office Court, Fleet Street, London.—Wednesday, March 8, 1876.

SUPPLEMENT TO THE NONCONFORMIST.

VOL. XXXVII.—NEW SERIES, No. 1581. LONDON: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1876. GRATIS.

THE DEBATE ON THE BURIALS QUESTION.

(*By a "Stranger."*)

If there was no excitement within the House of Commons, at the opening of the proceedings on Friday afternoon, there was plenty in the lobbies; for a great many more "strangers" wanted to get in than could possibly find admission. There was, of course, a ballot for places among the crowd of those who had members' orders for the Strangers' Gallery—one of those heavy ballots which take place only a few times during the session—and, of course, more were disappointed by their failure than could be gratified by success. For the Speaker's Gallery and other privileged places names had, of course, been put down previously; though those who had not secured seats by that method could not be easily persuaded that their admission was out of the question.

As may be supposed, Nonconformity was strongly represented. There were some well-known Dissenting ministers. Both the Treasurers of the Liberation Society were overhead, and in the seats below, behind the bar, was the Secretary, sitting nearest the Liberals, and in the corresponding place on the other side, Dr. Lee, the Secretary of the Church Defence Institution. I believe that the Nonconformist ladies mustered as strong in their gallery as did their relatives and friends at the other end of the House. The *John Bull*—which ought to know—says, "considering the subject under discussion, the clerical element was very sparsely represented"; but among those who came into the Peers' Gallery during the evening were the Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Gloucester, Rochester, Lichfield, and Ely.

There was a good, though not a large attendance of members at the opening of the sitting; but the number of cards by which places were secured showed that more were expected. The private business occupied very little time, and as even the petitions against the Burials resolution did not take much time, and the notices were few, there were frequent pauses, and the utmost quietude prevailed up to about a quarter to five, when Mr. Osborne Morgan was called upon.

He has never before had so good an audience; all his speeches in moving the second reading of the Burials Bill being made before the comparatively small House which assembles between twelve and one o'clock on Wednesdays. He began in a very businesslike way, by referring to the returns relating to closed churchyards and cemeteries, published only the day before, and which, he said, had strengthened his case even beyond his expectations. Suffering from cold, his voice was for a time thin, and he could not be very well heard: but he gained power as he proceeded, and made a speech which well deserved the praise that it received, for both its matter and its manner. He proceeded to deal with the law of the case, and took especial pains to show the fallacy of the idea that the admission of Dissenting services into the churchyard necessarily involved admission into the Church. He made good use of the Primate's inquiries into the law of foreign countries, and also of the law in Scotland and Ireland. If there were no grievance, why, he asked, had the other side brought in six bills to deal with it? The abuse objection he disposed of summarily, by asking why Englishmen should be libelled by the suggestion, that they would act as Irishmen and Scotchmen had *not* acted, and as even English Dissenters had not acted in parochial cemeteries? Then, with increasing warmth, he answered the objection that his motion was disestablishment in disguise; saying that, if it were determined to fight the battle of the Establishment in the churchyard, the Liberation Society would not quarrel with the choice, since they could not possibly select a better weapon than that which the present burial law placed in their hands—a statement which was loudly cheered on the Liberal side. He made effective reference to his own willingness to effect a compromise in past times, though compromise was now impossible; and, in a good passage, he contrasted the temperate memorial of the Churchmen who have expressed a wish for the settlement of the question, to the letter of the Bishop of Lincoln, which, he said, had done more to hasten disestablishment than all the Burials Bills. It was the Church of England which was the real sufferer from the prolongation of the struggle, and, whatever might be the issue of that night's debate, he and his supporters were confident that common-sense, common justice, and humanity, would at length prevail. Mr. Morgan—who spoke for about an hour and-a-quarter—was attentively heard throughout, and loudly cheered when he sat down.

Mr. Wykeham Martin, another Churchman, seconded the motion, and said that it was as a Churchman that he did so, for if he acted only as a Liberal he should wish for nothing better than the keeping open of the question. He excited some sensation by quoting the phrase of the Rev. T. Hugo—"the carrion of Dissent"—not naming him at first, and doing so only after being pressed by repeated cries of "Name, name."

The Home Secretary, Mr. Cross, rose without loss of time to meet the motion with a direct negative, and some momentary interest was felt in his speech, inasmuch as it was supposed that he would develope the policy of the Government. He, however, made no attempt to do that, except in so far as, in his closing sentences, he hinted that the question should be dealt with on sanitary grounds, and the inspection of churchyards be handed over to the Local Government Board. That his speech should have been highly praised for its cleverness and its logic shows how poorly off is the Conservative party in regard to debating power; for Mr. Cross's speech was nothing but a narrow, commonplace "Church Defence" platform speech—the speech of a quirking lawyer, rather than of a statesman and of a Minister of the Crown. He criticised the phraseology of the resolution with a self-complacent smallness, which seemed to show utter incapacity to grasp the substance of the question at issue. He was even unable to understand the terms of the resolution; since he asserted that it left Parliament to decide whether burials should be silent, or with a service. He denied that Dissenters had a grievance, because nothing was heard about it twenty years ago, and he mixed together two questions which had no connection, by lamenting that there was no power to compel parishes to provide burial-places. He tried to prove that the new returns showed that the grievance was fast diminishing. He made, however, one decided hit, when he quoted from a resolution of the Quaker body that, if other than their own members used their burial-grounds, it must be with the observance of Quaker rules. But he forgot the difference between the position of the Quaker body, and that of the Church of England as a National Church, and throughout his speech talked of it as though it were one of the sects.

At this point the debate entered on its second stage, for the dinner-hour had come, and the House began to thin. That, however, did not deter Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen from speaking; for he had to vindicate his vote for the resolution after his abstention last year. He strongly insisted on the folly of Churchmen in denationalising the Church by the character of their opposition to the measure, and said he should not be surprised if Mr. Disraeli himself disposed of the matter before this Parliament had run its course. Mr. Cunliffe Brooks, the Conservative member for East Cheshire, made a very oracular speech, which, so far as action and manner were concerned, might have been spoken by a statue. Mr. Allen, the Wesleyan, made the shortest speech of the debate, but it was weighty and to the point. He declared his belief that the Methodist body, to which he belonged, was thoroughly with Mr. Morgan, and he also expressed the conviction that the spread of Ritualism was rapidly depriving the Church of England of any support it had hitherto had from Methodists. Mr. Grantham, on the other side of the House, spoke with seriousness—not to say dullness, but said nothing new or striking.

That, however, cannot be remarked of Mr. Walter's speech. It was delivered in a very small House, not a score of members being on the Liberal side, and in a very quiet manner; but it was a revolutionary speech, in the sense that it pointed to a change far more sweeping than that proposed by the Burials Bill. He advocated, what may be termed the de-ecclesiasticising of the churchyards by taking the management of them out of the hands of the clergy, and placing it in the hands of the civil authorities. No doubt, he said, that ultimately many churchyards would have to be closed and cemeteries substituted, but, till that was needful, let the principle of Mr. Morgan's resolution be accepted.

When the Speaker left for tea, between eight and nine o'clock, Mr. Sackville had been called upon; but his speech, when delivered, left matters pretty much where it found them. Then it became evident that those who wished to speak must look after their chance, and when Mr. Sackville sat down a whole covey of would-be speakers rose on the Liberal benches, and among them Mr. Leatham and Mr. Richard. Sir Robert Anstruther was selected by the Speaker, and his speech was one of the most effective of the debate. He is a leading layman of the Established Church of Scotland; speaks with homeliness, but with pith, force, and raciness, and the line which he took was singularly well calculated to assist Mr. Morgan's resolution. "Talk of no safeguards against scandals!" he said, "why we have had open churchyards in Scotland for 300 years, and not a single scandal has arisen!" Was that only because Scotchmen were so superior to Englishmen? Or were Englishmen traducing their own kith and kin! Then he mercilessly ridiculed Mr. Cross, for the narrow way in which he had talked about the Church of England, as though it were not a National Church. Mr. Cross had spoken of churches and churchyards built by private subscriptions—had no other Established Church done the same thing in the same way? Then—after alluding to the suggestion that the Scotch Church was on its last legs—he triumphantly gave its latest church-building statistics, and said that, while the English Home Secretary thought it a monstrous thing that new churchyards should be open to Dissenters, the Scottish Establishment would never think of closing the gates against them. Nothing could be more telling than Sir Robert Anstruther's facts and the use which he made of them, and the impression produced was evident.

Now Mr. Talbot got his turn, but he seemed to be half afraid to use his opportunity, and talked in, for him, quite a subdued way. He created a laugh by saying, with reference to the concessions which he extorted from Mr. Osborne Morgan in a previous session, that one was not bound to accept when in power that which might have been accepted gladly in Opposition.

Sir William Harcourt next rose, to address a fast-filling House. He made a good opening, by reading in an impressive manner a letter from one of his constituents, over whose wife's remains the Church Service had been read, against the earnest protest of her husband, and Sir William said he had read the letter "with feelings of shame, of grief, and of indignation." But, after commenting on the facts, he said: "I am told that this is the law! If it be law, what a law! and how long will you allow it to remain law?" Sir William did not make so amusing a speech as he sometimes does; but it was the better for that, because it was in harmony with the subject. He contrasted, with great effect, the conduct of the Tories who, when in office, allowed Mr. Monson's Bill for altering the law in Ireland to pass, but were now resisting the application of the same principle to England. He wanted to know what was the ministerial policy, and Mr. Cross's hazy speech did not answer the question; while he had discussed totally irrelevant questions. He preferred looking to the Prime Minister—"a sagacious and prescient statesman, who, at this moment, is revolving in his mind schemes of escape from a situation which he knows to be untenable"—a sally which created great amusement. He himself was a friend to the Establishment; but the most disestablishment language he had heard in that House was the language of the Home Secretary that evening! He believed that what the friends of the Church should most desire was to remove injustice, and he refused to link its fortunes with dead and decaying privileges.

Mr. Raikes, the Chairman of Ways and Means, who had taken a conspicuous part in the deputation to Mr. Disraeli, naturally wished to join in the debate, and he had his opportunity when Sir

W. Harcourt sat down. But, like Mr. Talbot, he did not talk in the same fashion in the House as he does out of it—at any rate on Church Defence platforms. The old insolence of manner cropped out in the closing sentences, in which he alleged that the envy of the Dissenting ministers was at the bottom of the whole agitation. He also quoted some letters from Churchmen, giving, as the last, one from the Rev. Stephen Gladstone, "the bearer of an honoured name." There was nothing particular in this letter: it was quoted simply to afford to the speaker the malicious pleasure of casting the opinion of the son in the face of the father, who sat exactly opposite Mr. Raikes!

Once more a number of Liberal members rose, Mr. Leatham and Mr. Richard being again among them. The Speaker called on the former. Mr. Leatham was not so successful as usual, and therefore, not so well listened to. He predicted that the refusal to remedy this grievance would hasten and not avert disestablishment. After Mr. Pell on one side, and Mr. Watkin Williams on the other, had spoken to a House which evidently wished to close the debate, Mr. Disraeli rose, at a quarter to twelve. He spoke for only about twenty minutes, and with hesitation, and without saying much that was characteristic. The first point which seemed to produce any effect was—that the question was a sanitary, and not a sectarian one, at which the Liberals laughed, and his own side seemed puzzled. But, he proceeded to say, it was sectarian too, because those who brought forward the resolution really were aiming at disestablishment. More than once he spoke of the "very powerful" and the "well-organised" party by whom the demand for disestablishment was pressed, and, in fact, was as complimentary as the Liberation Society could desire. The time was, he said, when Nonconformists were content with toleration, whereas now they demanded religious equality—at which there were such ringing cheers as the mention of religious equality has never, within my knowledge, before elicited. Mr. Disraeli had to stop, and then when he proceeded to say, "those cheers prove exactly what I wish to have believed," they were again renewed. The religious equality party were seeking to upset the existing settlement and, therefore, though he regretted giving a vote which savoured at all of religious exclusiveness or bigotry—another loud Liberal cheer!—he must vote against the resolution.

The Marquis of Hartington spoke briefly and well, for him; one or two of his points being well put. He ridiculed the idea of treating this as only a sanitary question, and said that it was a mistake to suppose that the agitation would be stopped merely by lessening the area of the grievance.

At twenty-two minutes past twelve the Speaker rose to put the question, the House being then crowded. Owing to the very technical way in which the question was put, Mr. Morgan's supporters had to vote "No," and those on the other side "Aye," and one Tory member made a mistake, and went into the wrong lobby. The usual time in a large House was occupied by the division, and, as it was known that the motion would be defeated, the only question was—By how many? The Liberal Whips calculated thirty, and it is said that the figure of the Tory Whips was twenty-nine. The actual majority was thirty-one; but, if the vote of Lieut.-Col. Kennard be rectified, then it was thirty-two. There was a tremendous cheer on the Conservative side; but, as the Liberals had driven the Government closer than they have been driven before, they too could cheer, though, it must be owned, their opponents had the best of it in that respect. They always do, and the reason is said to be that there are so many more foxhunters on that than on the other side!

THE DIVISION LIST.

AYES—279.

Adderley, Sir C	Bourke, Hon R	Corbett, Colonel
Allen, Major	Bourne, Col	Cordes, T
Allsopp, C	Bousfield, Major	Cotton, W
Allsopp, H	Bright, R	Crichton, Lord
Arkwright, F	Brise, Col R	Cross, R A
Ashbury, J L	Broadley, W H	Cubitt, G
Asheton, R	Brooks, W C	Cunninghame, Sir W
Astley, Sir J	Brymer, W E	Dalkeith, Earl of
Bagge, Sir W	Buckley, Sir E	Davenport, W B
Bailey, Sir J R	Burrell, Sir P	Deakin, J H
Balfour, A J	Buxton, Sir R	Denison, C B
Baring, T C	Cameron, D	Denison, W B
Barne, F St. J	Campbell, C	Denison, W E
Barrington, Lord	Cartwright, F	Dickson, Major
Barttelot, Sir W B	Cawley, C E	Digby, Hon Capt
Bates, E	Cecil, Lord E	Disraeli, B
Bateson, Sir T	Chaplin, H	Dyott, Col R
Bathurst, A A	Chapman, J	Eaton, H W
Beach, Sir M H	Charley, W T	Edmonstone, Admrl
Beach, W W	Christie, W L	Egerton, Hon A
Bective, Earl	Churchill, Lord R	Egerton, Sir P G
Benett-Stanford, V	Clifton, T H	Egerton, Hon W
Bentinck, G C	Clive, Col	Elliot, G W
Bentinck, G W	Close, M C	Elphinstone, Sir W
Beresford, G	Clowes, S W	Emlyn, Lord
Beresford, Col	Cobbett, J M	Eslington, Lord
Birley, H	Cobbold, T C	Estcourt, G B
Blackburne, J I	Cole, Col H	Fellowes, E
Boord, T W	Coope, O E	Fielden, J
Finch, G H	Lacon, Sir E H B	Rodwell, B B H
Floyer, J	Lawrence, Sir T	Round, J
Folkestone, Lord	Learmonth, A	Russell, Sir C
Forester, C T W	Lee, Major V	Ryder, G R
Forsyth, W	Legard, Sir C	Sackville, S G S
Fraser, Sir W A	Legh, W J	Salt, T
Freshfield, C K	Leigh, Lieut-Col E	Sanderson, T R
Galwey, Sir W P	Leighton, S	Sandon, Lord
Galway, Lord	Lennox, Lord H G	Sclater-Booth, G
Gardner, J T A	Leslie, Sir J	Scott, Lord H
Gardner, R R	Lindsay, Col H L	Scott, M D
Garnier, J C	Lindsay, Lord	Scourfield, Sir J H
Gibson, E	Lloyd, S	Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H J
Gilpin, Sir R T	Lloyd, T E	Shute, General
Goddard, A L	Lopes, H C	Sidebottom, T H
Goldney, G	Lopes, Sir M	Simonds, W B
Gooch, Sir D	Lowther, Hon W	Smith, Abel
Gordon, E S	Lowther, J	Smith, Fred C
Gordon, W	MacIver, D	Smith, Samuel G
Gorst, J E	Majendie, L A	Smith, Wm Henry
Grantham, W	Makins, Colonel	Somerset, Lord H R
Greene, E	Malcolm, J W	Spinks, Serjt
Gregory, G B	Manners, Lord J	Stanhope, Hon E
Guinness, Sir A	March, Earl	Stanhope, W T W
Hall, A W	Marten, A G	Stanley, Hon F
Halsey, T F	Mellor, T W	Starkey, L R
Hamilton, Lord C J	Merewether, C G	Starkie, J P C
Hamilton, I T	Mills, A	Steere, L
Hamilton, Lord G	Mills, Sir C H	Storer, G
Hamilton, Hon R	Monckton, F	Sykes, C
Hamond, C F	Morgan, Hon F	Talbot, J G
Hanbury, R W	Mowbray, J R	Taylor, Col
Hardcastle, E	Naghten, Lt-Col	Tennant, R
Hardy, G	Neville-Grenville, R	Thornhill, T
Hardy, J S	Newdegate, C N	Thwaites, D
Harvey, Sir R B	Newport, Lord	Tynne, Lord H F
Hay, Sir J C D	Noel, G J	Tollemache, Hn W F
Heath, R	North, Colonel	Torr, J
Hermon, E	Northcote, Sir S	Tremayne, J
Hervey, Lord F	Onslow, D	Turnor, E
Heygate, W U	Paget, R H	Twells, P
Hildyard, T B	Palk, Sir L	Walker, T E
Hill, A S	Parker, Lt-Col W	Wallace, Sir R
Hinchingbrook, Ld	Pateshall, E	Walpole, Hon F
Hodgson, W N	Peek, Sir H	Walpole, S
Hogg, Sir J M	Pell, A	Waterhouse, S
Holford, J P G	Pemberton, E L	Watney, J
Holker, Sir J	Pennant, Hon G	Wellesley, Captain
Holland, Sir H T	Peploe, Major	Wells, E
Holmesdale, Lord	Percy, Earl	Wethered, T O
Home, Captain	Phipps, P	Wheelhouse, W S
Hood, Hon Captain A	Pim, Captain B	Williams, Sir F
Hope, A J B B	Plunket, Hon D B	Wilmot, Sir H
Hubbard, E	Plunkett, Hon R	Wilmot, Sir J E
Hubbard, J	Polhill-Turner, C	Wolff, Sir H D
Hunt, G W	Powell, W	Woodd, Basil T
Jenkinson, Sir G S	Praed, C T	Wroughton, P
Jervis, Colonel	Praed, H B	Wyndham, Hon P
Johnson, J G	Price, Captain	Yarmouth, Earl of
Joliffe, Hon S	Puleston, J H	Yorke, Hon E
Jones, J	Raikes, H C	Yorke, J R
Kennaway, Sir J H	Read, C S	
Knight, F W	Rendlesham, Lord	TELLERS.
Knightley, Sir R	Repton, G W	Sir W. Dyke
Knowles, T	Ridley, M W	Mr. Rowland Winn
	Ritchie, C T	

NOES—248.

Acland, Sir T D	Ewing, A O	Mundella, A J
Adam, W P	Fawcett, H	Muntz, P H
Allen, W S	Fay, C J	Muro, Col
Amory, Sir J H	Ferguson, R	Murphy, N D
Anderson, G	Fitzmaurice, Lord E	Neville, C W
Anstruther, Sir R	Fitzwilliam, Hon C	Noel, E
Antrobus, Sir E	Fletcher, I	Nolan, Capt
Ashley, Hon E M	Foljambe, F J	Norwood, C M
Backhouse, E	Forster, Sir C	O'Byrne, W R
Balfour, Sir G	Forster, W E	O'Callaghan, Hon W
Barclay, A C	Gladstone, W E	O'Clery, K
Barclay, J W	Gladstone, W H	O'Donoghue, The
Bass, A	Goldsmid, Sir F	O'Gorman, P
Baxter W E	Goldsmid, J	O'Keeffe, J
Bazley, Sir T	Gordon, Sir A H	O'Shaughnessy, R
Beaumont, Major I	Goschen, G	O'Sullivan, W H
Beaumont, W B	Gourley, E T	Parnell, C S
Bell, I L	Gower, Hon E I	Pease, J W
Biddulph, M	Grieve, J J	Peel, A W
Biggar, J G	Hankey, T	Peel, Sir R
Blake, T	Harcourt, Sir W V	Pender, J
Blennerhassett, R	Harrison, C	Pennington, F
Bolckow, H W F	Harrison, J F	Perkins, Sir F
Brady, J	Hartington, Marquis of	Philips, R N
Brassey, H A	Havelock, Sir H	Playfair, L
Brassey, T	Hayter, A D	Portman, Hon W
Briggs, W E	Henry, M	Potter, T B
Bright, John	Herbert, H A	Price, W E
Bright, Jacob	Hill, T R	Ralli, P
Bristowe, S B	Hodgson, K D	Ramsay, J
Brogden, A	Holland, S	Rashleigh, Sir C
Brooks, M	Holms, J	Rathbone, W
Brown, J C	Holms, W	Redmond, W A
Browne, G E	Hopwood, C H	Reed, E J
Bruce, Lord I	Howard, Hon C W	Richard, H
Burt, T	Hughes, W B	Ripley, H W
Butt, I	Ingram, W J	Robertson, H
Callan, P	James, W H	Rothschild, Sir N
Cameron, C	James, Sir H	Russell, Lord A
Campbell, Sir G	Jenkins, D J	Rylands, P
Campbell-Bannerman, H	Johnstone, Sir H	St. Aubyn, Sir J
Carington, Hon Col	Kemealy, Dr	Samuda, J D'A
Cartwright, W C	Kennard, Col	Samuelson, B
Cave, T	Kensington, Lord	Seely, C
Cavendish, Lord F C	Kinnaird, Hon A	Shaw, W
Cavendish, Lord G	Knatchbull-Hugessen, E	Shell, E
Chadwick, D	Laing, S	Sheridan, H B
Chaine, J	Lambert, N G	Sheriff, A C
Chambers, Sir T	Laverton, A	Simon, Mr Serjt.
Cholmeley, Sir F	Law, H	Smith, E
Clarke, J C	Lawrence, Sir J G	Stacpoole, W
Clifford, C C	Lawson, Sir W	Stansfeld, J
Clive, G	Leatham, E A	Stevenson, J C
Cogan, W H	Leeman, G	Stewart, M J
Cole, H T	Lefevre, G J S	Stuart, Col
Colebrooke, Sir T E	Leith, J F	Sullivan, A M
Collins, E	Lewis, C E	Swanston, A
Colman, J J	Lloyd, M	Talbot, C R M
Cory, J P	Locke, J	Tavistock, Marq. of
Cotes, C C	Lorne, Marquis of	Taylor, D
Cowan, James	Lowe, R	Taylor, P A
Cowen, Joseph	Lubbock, Sir J	Temple, W Cowper
Cowper, Hon H F	Lusk, Sir A	Torrens, W T M'C
Crawford, J S	Macdonald, A	Tracy, Hon C R D
Cross, J K	Macduff, Lord	Villiers, C P
Crossley, J	Macgregor, D	Vivian, A P
Davies, D	Mackintosh, C F	Vivian, H H
Davies, R	M'Arthur, A	Waddy, S D
Dilke, Sir C W	M'Arthur, W	Walsh, Hon A
Dillwyn, L L	M'Kenna, Sir J N	Walter, J
Dixon, G	M'Lagan, P	Waterlow, Sir S H
Dodds, J	M'Laren, D	Watkin, Sir E
Dodson, J G	Maitland, J	Weguelin, T M
Douglas, Sir G	Maitland, W F	Whalley, G H
Duff, M E G	Marjoribanks, Sir D	Whitbread, S
Duff, R W	Massey, W N	Whitworth, B
Dunbar, J	Maxwell, Sir W	Williams, W
Dundas, J C	Meldon, C H	Wilson, C
Earp, T	Middleton, Sir A M	Wilson, Sir M
Edwards, H	Milbank, F A	Yeaman, J
Egerton, Hon A F	Monk, C J	Young, A W
Ellice, E	Montagu, Lord R	TELLERS.
Ennis, N	Morley, S	Morgan, O
Evans, T W		Martin, W

PAIRS.

FOR	AGAINST.
Colonel Kingscote	Colonel Chaplin
Lord R. Grosvenor	Mr. O. Gore
Sir P. O'Brien	Sir G. Greenall
Mr. A. More	Mr. S. Moore
Sir H. Jackson	Hon. T. Bruce
Lord De Grey	Lord Muncaster
Sir T. Sinclair	Mr. Baillie Cochrane
Right Hon. H. Childers	Mr. A. P. Arkwright
Sir F. Davie	Mr. Bulwer
Mr. Plimsoll	Mr. W. Knatchbull
Mr. Whitwell	Mr. C. Wynn
Mr. Kay-Shuttleworth	Lord Helmsley
Mr. C. Palmer	Mr. Holt
Mr. M. Bass	Right Hon. J. W. Henley
Sir J. Esmonde	Sir W. W. Wynn
Mr. Marling	Sir F. Johnstone
Dr. Lush	Right Hon. S. Cave
Dr. Ward	Major Cust
Mr. Herschell	Mr. Drax
Mr. R. Smyth	General Sir P. Herbert
Mr. Carter	Sir G. Elliott
Mr. P. Martin.	Mr. Dawson Damer.
Sir C. O'Loghlan.	Mr. Butler-Johnstone.

Last year 236 members (including tellers) voted, and 17 paired, for the Burials Bill:—total, 253. This year, after deducting Lt.-Col. Kennard's vote given in mistake—249 members (including tellers) voted, and 23 paired, for the resolution:—total, 272; being an increase of 19. Notwithstanding the great change which took place at the general election, the number who voted with Morgan this year is but 31 less than it was in 1873.

Thirty-four Liberals who did not vote last year voted for the resolution. Some of these are new members. Last year 7 Conservatives voted with Mr. Morgan: this year the number is increased to 11; besides Sir R. Peel and Mr. Ripley, whose position it is difficult to define. Two other Conservatives, viz, Mr. Russell Gurney (ill) and the Marquis of Hamilton, who voted for the bill last year, were absent on this occasion.

As many as 35 Liberals who voted for the bill last session were absent this; but 15 of them paired. Of these absentees several are ill, or abroad, and of a dozen Irish absentees several were obliged to be in Ireland, at the assizes.

The Conservatives brought up 56 members who did not vote last year; though 17 of them paired. On the other hand, they lost the votes of 27 who voted last year; but 21 of these were paired. This loss includes the votes of the Conservative members for Leominister and Manchester, now replaced by Liberals. The net gain of the opponents of the Burial Bill, as the result of the agitation of the recess, appears to be 33 votes—out of the 77 absentees last year.

The following were absent from the late division unpaired:—

ENGLISH AND WELSH (8).

Brocklehurst, W. C.	Fothergill, R.
Brown, A. H.	Horsman, E. (ill)
Corbett, John	Roebuck, J. A.
Foster, W. H.	Stanton, A. J.

SCOTCH (5).

Jenkins, E. (abroad)	Stafford, Marq. of
M'Combie, W. „	Trevelyan, G. (ill)
Matheson, A.	

IRISH (19).

Bryan, G. L. (ill)	O'Conor, D.
Dalway, M.	O'Leary, W.
Dease, E.	O'Reilly, M.
Dickson, T.	Power, P.
Digby, K.	Ronayne, P.
Downing, M.	Sherlock, D.
Kirk, G.	Smyth, P.
McCarthy, J.	Synan, E. J.
Martin, P.	Whitworth, W.
O'Conor Don,	

This makes a total of 42 unpaired Liberals.

The following members of the late Liberal Government voted in the minority for the motion:—Mr. Adam, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Bright, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Lord F. Cavendish, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Grant Duff, Mr. Forster, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. W. H. Gladstone, Mr. Goschen, Lord Hartington, Sir W. Harcourt, Sir H. James, Lord Kensington, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Playfair, Mr. Arthur W. Peel, and Mr. Stansfeld. In the same lobby were eleven Conservatives—Mr. J. Chaine, Mr. J. P. Corry, Sir George Douglas, Mr. Orr Ewing, Sir A. H. Gordon, Mr. Charles Lewis, Sir W. Stirling-Maxwell, Lord Robert Montagu, Mr. C. W. Nevill, Mr. Mark Stewart, and Mr. Arthur Walsh. Five of these voted with Mr. Morgan last year, while Mr. Russell Gurney and the Marquis of Hamilton, who then formed part of the minority, were not now present.

COMMENTS OF THE PRESS.

The *Times* thinks that the debate and division were decisive in favour of the principle involved in the Burials Bill. It was not "an inappreciable grievance," as Mr. Cross described it, which brought 527 members to vote at the beginning of March, but an urgent political question. Mr. Disraeli himself endeavoured to rally his followers, and everything was done that is possible in such a matter to make the division, so far as the Conservatives were concerned, a party one. What was the result? The Government command ordinarily a majority of something like fifty in the House; but with all their efforts they could only defeat this resolution by thirty-one. The occasion cannot fail to mark a critical point in the history of the contest. Such

a defeat is a moral victory, and the Burials Bill, or some similar measure, has been further advanced in one night than by all its successes in a Liberal House. There is something incredibly rash in the manner in which, upon all occasions, the Conservative statesmen do their utmost to make every threatened defeat on a point of detail an implied defeat on the gravest questions of Church and State. But such a shield for their resistance would never be put forward unless they had felt that on the principles actually at issue good sense was against them. The essential point with which they fail to deal is that the question is not merely that of a grievance; it is that of a natural necessity. It is undeniable that Dissenters do die in parishes where the churchyard is the only fitting place available for their interment, and the longer the controversy is continued the more frequent are the instances of such a difficulty which are brought to light. It is evident that the difficulty has been for a long time endured with a degree of silence and acquiescence which is itself a guarantee for the propriety which may be expected to be observed when the churchyards are thrown open. But if cases do arise in which a man must needs be buried in a churchyard, the refusal to allow him to be buried with the services of his own denomination is an intolerance against which we should think no protest too strong if it were exhibited in the Roman Catholic countries of the Continent. No answer can really be made to the argument that we are exhibiting a bigotry of which the most reactionary countries in Europe have become ashamed in insisting on allowing no religious service but that of the Church of England in our graveyards. One such case of injustice is as bad as a hundred; and, when once attention is drawn to it, it is impossible that redress can be long refused. We shall before long have to revert everywhere to the ancient and far more salutary custom of cemeteries at a distance from the abodes and from the ordinary haunts of the living. But something must be done meanwhile, and to this comparatively limited necessity the question really reduces itself. A measure to compel all parishes at once to provide cemeteries is inconceivable. So long as the churchyard can be used without injury to health or to decency it would be an extravagant addition to local burdens to tax the ratepayers for a cemetery. During, perhaps, the next twenty years there will remain a good many parishes, though a continually diminishing number, in which Nonconformists must be buried in the churchyard; and the question is whether during this period of transition they are or are not to be allowed the right of sepulture in accordance with the principles and practice of their own faiths. Let the natural necessity of burial be once admitted, and the necessity of according religious freedom in the satisfaction of it must inevitably be allowed. From this issue no compromise can possibly extricate the Government, the Conservative party, or the Church, and the longer they refuse to make the inevitable concession, the more unwelcome will be the form in which it must finally be extorted from them.

Mr. Cross, says the *Daily News*, so far as his mode of reasoning could prevail, overthrew every claim of the Established Church to be regarded as the National Church of England. Over and over again he claimed, and ever with increasing emphasis, the liberty, as he called it, of the Established Church to retain its buildings and churchyards for the use of its own regular members. "Is she," he asked indignantly, "to be the only religious body within the realm which cannot appropriate her own churchyards to the use of her own members?" The answer ought to have been left to some earnest champion of the Establishment. Such a person might be imagined rising indignantly and saying to Mr. Cross, "Certainly she is to be the only religious body thus restricted. That is her pride, her duty, her plea of right against those who would reduce her to the level of a sect. She has nothing to do with sects. She is a national institution; her members are all who enter her doors or are borne by their friends within her precincts." If Mr. Cross pursues a little further the same style of argument he may be found some day declaring that it is an attack upon the freedom and the rights of the House of Commons to deny it the right of choosing its own members and shut out everybody it does not like, as the Reform Club and the Carlton Club do. "Talk of liberty," said the Home Secretary with contemptuous emphasis, "while you deny to the Established Church the right of closing her gates when she likes." Exactly, and talk of liberty while you will not allow the same right to the House of Commons; talk of liberty while you will not allow the Heir to the Throne to sit as a member of the same House. The answer to all this part of Mr. Cross's speech was only too obvious. It is expressed in a sentence. The Church of England cannot have what Mr. Cross calls the liberty of a sect while she claims to be a national institution.

Mr. Disraeli's followers, says the *Daily Telegraph*, conquered by merely thirty-one. There was a time in English politics when such a preponderance on a great night, a prepared occasion, a foreseen party debate, would hardly have been held enough; it would not have been called "a good working majority" by a Ministry in the first half of this century. Mr. Gladstone was treated with scant courtesy both by old followers and new foes because the Liberal majority he won in 1868 had vanished by 1874. But, if his army had diminished, it could point to great victories inscribed on its torn banners; if they were wearied and worsted at the end, they had marched far and done much, and at last fell in the fierce *melee* of a sudden general election. What has Mr. Disraeli done with his majority? Little or nothing; yet his fifty or sixty in 1874 becomes thirty-one in 1876, despite any amount of Church influence, sectarian passion, fanatical circulars, urgent canvassing, and active "whips." During the debate Mr. Cross defended the exclusiveness of the clergy by quoting the example of the Quakers. Nonconformists think they say something bitter when they call the Church "an Established sect," but here the Conservative Home Secretary virtually maintains that it is a sect like another, and that whatever is done by any of them it also may do. This is certainly placing the National Establishment on a narrow basis. The Quakers are the most voluntary sect we have—the most dissevered, not only from our Government and officials, but even from our courts of law, the least indebted to old endowments, a purely private collection of Englishmen, retaining to excess their individualism and independence. Yet Mr. Cross compares the Church to them, and retorts that as the Quakers will not allow Church services in their cemeteries, the Church will not tolerate Dissenting hymns in its graveyards. But the demand of the Dissenters is based on old national use of the parish graveyards, and there is no such old national use to justify a Churchman in insisting on burial in a Quaker cemetery. Whatever links of doctrine, or liturgy, or descent, still bind the Anglican to the Papal Church, nothing of the kind is found in the north of this island, and the history of the land is bound up with hatred to "Rome." Nevertheless, Roman Catholic priests, in full canonical garb, are permitted to officiate in Scottish graveyards to bury their own dead. Mr. Cross admits this, but says it is because the burial-places are owned by "the heritors." That is the very change we desire here. Place the control in lay hands, and the unseemly strife, fed by sacredotalism, will at once die down. Taking Mr. Disraeli's defence at its full value, what does it amount to? An admission that a serious public duty imposed by the law on the parochial clergy has been so grossly neglected, that in the interests of the living many churchyards still used must be treated as nuisances gravely affecting the public health. If this has been the conduct of the present controllers of the churchyards, why should they be permitted to continue to monopolise a function for which, according to the Prime Minister, they have proved themselves unfit?

The *Morning Advertiser* says that "there is no real grievance, and therefore no so-called relief should be granted. Not one out of twenty or perhaps fifty Dissenters feel any hardship in the existing state of things; and, as a matter of fact, the relatives of the deceased prefer, as a rule, to use the consecrated portions of cemeteries and the services of the Church clergy. Much as we deprecate the cry of 'no surrender' in most matters, we hold that it is justified in this, and we do so because we cannot disguise from ourselves that if the burials proposition of Mr. Osborne Morgan and his friends is carried the disestablishment of the Church must inevitably follow."

The *Hour* seems to wish some concession to what it describes as the feelings of humanity.

The *Standard* holds that it is not the division but the argument which will remain embedded in the popular mind. Mr. Morgan calls the exclusion of Dissenters from our churchyards inconsistent with the plainest dictates of religious toleration. But religious toleration is simply the toleration of religious differences, or, in other words, abstinence from active persecution of them. Toleration does not mean the surrender of your own rights or your own convictions, but simply respect for the rights and convictions of other people. If the Dissenters have a legal right to the churchyard it is not intolerance, but injustice, to keep them out of it. If they have not, it is not more intolerant in the Church to keep her churchyards to herself than it is in Dissenting communities to keep their burial grounds to themselves.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* does not much believe in the personal grievances arising out of the burials question, and thinks that if the law were altered as Mr. Osborne Morgan wishes, probably few Dissenters would care to claim their rights, and those who did so would view the performance of their own service rather as a triumph over the parson than as a solace to themselves. The resolution which Mr. Osborne Morgan moved is either founded on a fallacy, or it is the thin end of a very big wedge indeed. If the common-law right of the parishioners gives them a moral claim to be buried under other conditions than the law has imposed, why should it not give them an equal claim to use the churchyards as grazing grounds or for any other common purpose? Every parishioner has a common-law right to the use of the parish church, but is it therefore "just and right" to permit services other than those of the Church of England to be performed in them. Let Dissenters disestablish the Church if they can—that is honest warfare; but while the Church remains established why try to effect an entrance through a side door? But the *Pall Mall* does not sympathise with the "No surrender" cry. Those clergymen who adopt it would better consult their own character and the eventual settlement of the controversy upon reasonable terms by not throwing themselves into the breach with quite so much passion. But a notion of lifting the question out of a sectarian into a sanitary atmosphere was rather ingenious than happy. There may be many churchyards which ought to be closed, and which, if that transfer of the supervision of them to Mr. Sclater-Booth which Mr. Disraeli professed to think might lay the question to rest were effected, would be closed very soon and very peremptorily. But there must be thousands of churchyards throughout the country where no such necessity exists, nor is likely to exist for generations; and under these circumstances it will be well to look elsewhere for an escape from the difficulty than to any anticipated action of the Local Government Board.

John Bull remarks:—The Liberals say the Tories offer no compromise. They are right. A compromise is impossible. Whatever theoretic Broad-Church deans and London clergymen without churchyards may say, Churchmen will not voluntarily abandon the use of the Church of England service by her own clergy. They will admit willingly, not what has been called silent burial, but interment in the churchyard after a religious service in the chapel or house of the deceased; and why that should be considered derogatory which is the custom in Scotland, we are at a loss to conceive. Mr. Osborne Morgan thought he made a great hit when he read a letter addressed by the Bishop of Lincoln to the *Standard*, the bigoted utterances of which he contended did more to disestablish the Church than all the efforts of the Liberation Society. Let us say at once that that letter explains the reason why Churchmen cannot yield on this question. Disclaiming, as the mass of them do, as strongly as Mr. Osborne Morgan the uncharitable language towards Dissenters of a letter in the *Church Times* attributed to Mr. Thomas Hugo, the reading of which was the one point the Opposition made, we acknowledge frankly that we, who believe "schism" to be a sin from which we pray to be delivered in life, cannot conscientiously allow ministers other than those episcopally ordained to minister in grounds consecrated by episcopal hands. The State may force it upon us; but it is not for the Church to surrender the keys of the churchyards, which are in effect those of the churches themselves. The clergy have grievances—real and pressing ones—in this matter, to which no allusion was made last night; and if legislation does ensue, it may lead to results little anticipated by Mr. Osborne Morgan and his friends—as, for example, the blessing, as in the Church of Rome, of particular spots of ground, and the recitation by fanatical laymen—whom the law could not reach—of offices intending to deconsecrate ground where Nonconformists are buried.

The result and the incidents of the debate, says the *Birmingham Daily Post*, have armed the advanced wing of the Nonconformists with a new and powerful weapon of attack. They can now point out, with irresistible force, that their moderate allies need expect nothing from the prudence, the fears, or the moderation of their opponents. They may therefore contend—and the facts strongly support their position—that it is useless to think of being content with anything short of all that is demanded. Mr. Disraeli asserts the supremacy of Churchmen as an essential part of the Constitution, and thereby invites and compels reform of the Constitution. Mr. Cross defends churchyards, because they are Church property, in which Nonconformists have no share, and thereby does his best to strip the Church of its claim to be national, and exhibits it in the odious light of a favoured sect. Such defenders make the triumph of their opponents only a question of time, and not of a long time, either.

The *Leeds Mercury* remarks that it was at the bidding of the clergy that the Ministry and their supporters showed so valiant a front to Mr. Osborne Morgan. All through the debate it was evident that these lay champions of an obsolete clerical privilege had little stomach for the contest in which they were engaged; but party obligations imposed it upon them, and they did their best in what they must be well aware is a hopeless warfare. That the result of the division was creditable to their party discipline cannot be doubted; but the comparative smallness of the majority which voted with Mr. Disraeli proved the distaste of his followers for the duty he had called upon them to perform. The Nonconformists of England, who are content to pay the penalty of their Nonconformity in many different ways, and who are well aware of the social disadvantages which their religious independence must impose upon them whilst they dwell under the shadow of so vast a fabric as that of the Establishment, are not content any longer to be exposed to a paltry grievance which pursues them to their very graves. It may be a small matter, a sentimental wrong; but it is felt and resented and it must be removed. To say that this removal can be effected by any other means than those proposed by Mr. Osborne Morgan, and accepted by such good Churchmen as Mr. Walter, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, and Sir William Harcourt, is to come to the most perverse of all conclusions. The provision of cemeteries is doubtless a most desirable thing, and it may be that when that provision has been supplied, the grievance of the Nonconformist parishioner will have been reduced to the vanishing point. But nobody dreams at this moment of providing cemeteries everywhere for the use of Dissenters, and the only practical remedy for a grievance which is acknowledged to exist by all, save a section of the clergy and the subservient

majority which votes at the bidding of the Ministerial whip, is the opening of the parish churchyards to all classes of the parishioners upon terms of perfect equality. So certain it is that this solution of the question will be reached, and reached before long, that it seems scarcely worth while to rebuke the petty bigotry and mischievous narrowness displayed last night by Mr. Osborne Morgan's opponents. They are on the losing side in this great struggle, and they know it; something therefore may be forgiven to them by those who, though defeated now, are certain of an early and a complete victory. But it is interesting to observe the fidelity of the Tory party to its ancient traditions. Judged only by the speeches of last night, it might have learned nothing since the days when it fought with the courage of despair against the repeal of the Test Acts. Clearly it is still the old party, possessed by the old ideas, inspired by the old bigotry, and working for the old ends of narrowness, exclusion, and privilege—the predominance of a section at the expense of a nation.

The "drum ecclesiastic," says the *Bradford Observer*, has not been beaten in vain. The pressure which the clerical party have put upon members and Ministers has resulted in a rather larger majority against Mr. Osborne Morgan's resolution than that which last year negatived his bill. A few more Conservatives, who would willingly have stayed away, have been whipped up to vote, and the Ministry and the Church have carried the day by a majority of thirty-one in a very full House. If our opponents are satisfied with this result we are by no means inclined to lament over it. They have succeeded in retaining an injustice for a little while longer; but in so doing they have shown how narrow a majority they can command, even in a Parliament returned during the full swing of the Conservative reaction. Such a victory is the sure forerunner of rapidly-approaching defeat. For our part we can afford to wait; and the longer this measure of simple justice is put off the greater will be the determination of the people not only to settle this question, but also to remove the clergy once and for all from all temptation to claim and abuse special privileges. We have often shown that members of the Church of England ought to be more cordial supporters of Mr. Morgan's bill than Nonconformists. The latter may be content to endure injustice for a while, in the certainty that if the question of burials is not dealt with separately it will form part of a more extended reform. The clergy, who have prevailed upon reluctant laymen to vote against permitting Nonconformist services in churchyards, have been very materially aiding the work of the Liberation Society. Clerical dictation disgusts and disheartens even those who submit to it; and many of those who voted as they were told must have been galled by the yoke, and would be glad to break it from off their necks if they only dared. On the other hand, this policy of "No surrender" on the part of the Church strengthens and unites all those who desire reform. The vote of last night will in many ways hasten the advent of disestablishment.

The *Manchester Guardian* says that Mr. Disraeli's great discovery that this is a sanitary question will deceive no one. It has its sanitary aspect, no doubt. The churchyards are getting full, and every year the necessity for providing additional accommodation for the dead will become more and more urgent. In many parishes, however, there will be space enough for all for years to come, and it would be a grave injustice to saddle such places with the cost and maintenance of new burying grounds merely in order that the clerical conscience might not be offended. There is but one way out of this controversy. The churchyards, new as well as old—we are here reporting the language of so moderate a Liberal and so devoted a Churchman as Mr. Walter—must be declared to be cemeteries for all public purposes. The public sense of justice will be satisfied with nothing less than this, and the sooner the Conservatives realise the fact the better it will be for the institution which they so highly prize but which their present tactics so gravely compromise.

The result of the division, says the *Manchester Examiner*, was received, we are informed, with cheers and counter-cheers, so that both parties must be understood as professing to regard the division as a triumph. It is not, however, difficult to see on which side lies the reality of success. For the last few months, as we all know, the drum ecclesiastic has been beaten in every parish in the kingdom. All over the country the clergy have gone about proclaiming that those who were not for them were against them. Every Conservative member has been told in the most explicit manner that if he voted for Mr. O. Morgan's Resolution, or even abstained from voting against it, he would put his seat in peril; while the Government have found themselves compelled to defer so far to the clamour of their ecclesiastical supporters as to make overt opposition to the motion a test of party allegiance. Every means of influence and pressure at the command either of clerical operators, or of the Ministerial "whip" has been unsparingly resorted to, and, under these circumstances, no one can deny that the division of the other evening represented the maximum of resistance—willing or unwilling—which could be brought to bear against the proposition before the House. If it indicates the strength of party cohesion, it also betrays the strain to which that cohesion is subject, and to which a prudent leader must see the danger of continuously exposing it. The language held by the Ministers was a singular combination of laborious trifling and of rash defiance. Only one construction could be put upon it, that they see no middle term between maintaining the present law and conceding the claims of the Nonconformists; and if it be once made plain that this is the only available alternative, the shrewder and also the fairer-minded Conservatives can hardly remain long in doubt as to their choice, and can only regard the adoption by the Government of a line of argument so completely alien to the sympathies of their followers as an indication of the Prime Minister's desire to wash his hands of ecclesiastical prejudices which he does not share, and which it is no longer convenient to cultivate. The first step in the education of the party would be successfully taken if they could once be induced to regard this hitherto burning question as a detail of sanitary administration. The attempt to lower it to this level is no uncertain indication of the real purpose which lies beneath arguments which at first sight strike one as little better than Parliamentary persiflage. As was said more than once in the course of the debate, nothing can better serve the purpose of the Liberation Society than the permanent keeping open of a raw which they may irritate when arguments of a more abstract kind fail of effect. At present Mr. Disraeli affects not to discern a truth which is constantly becoming more and more obvious to his lay, if not to his clerical, followers. But this is one of those truths which a statesman, without any violent breach of consistency, can always discover for himself at any moment when it becomes convenient for his purpose. It is essentially a matter of time, opportunity, construction, expediency, and other things of a like sort, in reference to which all Ministers reserve to themselves a very large latitude of action. Because Mr. Disraeli condescended to echo in a general way the talk of inferior men, we do not see any reason to believe that he intends to be fettered by it. His emancipation from prejudices which he hardly affects to treat as anything better than an oratorical resource can hardly be otherwise than facilitated by a division which he cannot suppose to represent the real opinion of the party behind him. In the division on Friday evening the Nonconformists can hardly be mistaken in seeing the beginning of the end for which they have so long contended.

The *Scotsman* regards the "mechanical majority" of 31 not as a Government victory, but a warning that stubborn opposition to the requests of English Dissenters as to burials will not be much longer possible. Neither Mr. Cross nor Mr. Disraeli were reassuring to their supporters. They were fighting Mr. Morgan's resolution, and nothing more. As Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen said, there was ground for hope Mr. Disraeli will do with this question as he has done with others—oppose the demand as long as possible, and then discover that he has always been in favour of granting it. Whether in such cases he will be able to carry the "children of the Church" with him is another matter, as to which all that need be said is, that manifestly they do not like the prospect. The "children of the Church" are intent upon keeping live Dissenting ministers out of the churchyards, and argue that if any concession is made in this direction, the Church will be in direct danger of disestablishment. From the churchyard to the Church is only a step, they say, and if the Dissenting minister get into the churchyard he will insist upon getting into the Church. In Scotland, such arguments can be appraised at their true value. Here, that which the Churchmen oppose as dangerous, is the constant practice; and nobody believes that the Church is in any more danger of disestablisment because thereof. Mr. Cross undertook to set the House right in reference to Scotland's practice as to burials, and he succeeded in showing himself hopelessly wrong. Presbyterianism, which, as Mr. Cross knows, is the religion of the Established Church in Scotland, discourages services at the grave; yet nobody ever thinks of interfering with Dissenters—such as Episcopalians or Roman Catholics—who may wish to have services at the grave. Mr. Cross pointed to what he regarded as the great difference between English and Scotch churchyards: the latter, he said, "were free from ecclesiastical dominion altogether." Was that a safe argument to use? Is ecclesiastical dominion a thing likely to find favour in these days? Is there not, in fact, a danger that, in defending the churchyards on such a ground, the Church herself may suffer?

THE HALIFAX VICAR'S RATE.—Fifty persons were summoned at the Halifax Borough Court, on Saturday, for non-payment of the vicar's rate. The defence took a technical objection to the notice served on the defendants, and the proceedings were deferred, Sir Henry Edwards, Bart. chairman of the Bench, remarking that the defendants had obtained "only a temporary triumph."

THE RITUALIST QUESTION AT FOLKESTONE.—The usual celebration of holy communion at St. Peter's Church was not held on Sunday. Morning prayer was performed at half-past ten, after which the Rev. C. J. Ridsdale gave a short address, and announced that holy communion would not be celebrated any more at St. Peter's Church pending the appeal to the Privy Council. He urged his hearers to avail themselves of the opportunity of communicating at the other churches during the suspension, and himself and several of the congregation went to St. Micheal's Church, where the mode of celebration is very similar to that at St. Peter's. The crucifix and stations of the cross remained in their places.

CAVE HOUSE SCHOOL, UXBRIDGE.
Established 1820.

PRINCIPAL—MR. ARTHUR GEORGE GAYFER, Undergraduate Trinity College, Dublin, Associate of the College of Preceptors, Fellow of the Educational Institute of Scotland, and formerly one of the Senior Masters of the Bedfordshire County College.

In this School will be found thoroughly efficient teaching, and very superior home comforts. Extensive premises, good playgrounds, gardens, and a large comfortably furnished reading-room, with library, are attached to the School for the use of pupils. Very successful in all examinations, over 60 boys during the past three or four years have passed the Cambridge, Oxford, and College of Preceptor's Examinations. Mr. Gayfer, assisted by a staff of five Masters, makes an earnest endeavour to really educate and train his pupils, and not to cram them.

Fees moderate and inclusive.

A liberal reduction made for the sons of ministers.

THE NORTHERN CONGREGATIONAL SCHOOL,
SILCOATES HOUSE, NEAR WAKEFIELD.
ESTABLISHED 1831.

Principal—Rev. JAMES BEWGLASS, M.A., LL.D., M.R.I.A., assisted by competent Masters.

JOHN CROSSLEY, Esq., M.P., Halifax, Chairman.
W. H. LEE, Esq., J.P., Wakefield, Treasurer.
J. R. WOLSTENHOLME, M.A., Wakefield, Hon. Sec.
Rev. JAMES RAE, B.A., Batley, Hon. Finance Sec.

COMMITTEE.

Rev. Robert Bruce, M.A., Huddersfield.	J. Briggs, Esq., J.P., Wakefield.
Rev. Bryan Dale, M.A., Halifax.	T. W. Burnley, Esq., Gomersal.
Rev. Chas. Illingworth, York.	George Clay, Esq., Dewsbury.
Rev. J. James, F.S.S., Morley.	Esau Hanson, Esq., Halifax.
Rev. James Rae, B.A., Batley.	H. Sugden, Esq., Brighouse.
Rev. J. R. Wolstenholme, M.A., Wakefield.	W. H. Lee, Esq., J.P., Wakefield
	Joshua Taylor, Esq., Batley.

M. Wilks, Esq., Manchester.

The Committee of the above School have pleasure in announcing, that a new building has just been erected capable of accommodating one hundred Pupils, and specially adapted to secure their domestic comfort. "The school itself is an excellently-contrived building, where . . . . nothing has been spared to provide fine, lofty, and well-furnished classrooms. I examined the dormitories, lavatories, &c., and found them superior to most that I have inspected. The situation cannot well be surpassed for healthiness."—Extract from the Cambridge Examiner's Report, Midsummer, 1874.

The course of instruction includes all branches of a sound Classical, Mathematical, and Commercial Education, so as to fit the Pupils for any department of business, or for entrance at the Universities.

There are two periods of vacation: one of six weeks (at Midsummer), and one for three weeks (at Christmas).

Applications for admission to be sent to the Principal.

For Prospectuses, with a view of the School Premises, Terms, and further information, apply to the Principal or Secretary.

TETTENHALL COLLEGE, STAFFORDSHIRE.

HEAD MASTER—
ALEXANDER WAUGH YOUNG, Esq., M.A. (London), Gold Medalist in Classics, late Andrew's Scholar and First Priseman in Higher Senior Mathematics of University College, London, Fellow of University College, London.

SECOND MASTER—
JAMES SHAW, Esq., B.A., (London), First in the First class in Classical Honours at both First and Second B.A. Examinations,

ASSISTED BY NINE OTHER MASTERS.

The College enjoys the following Scholarships:—
The Directors' Scholarship ..... 25 Guineas per annum.
Senior Tettenhall " ..... 30 "
Junior Tettenhall " ..... 25 "
Tenable at the College.

The Shaw Scholarship ..... £30 per annum.
he Mander " ..... £30 "
Tenable for three years at the Oxford, Cambridge, or London Universities.

For rospectus and information as to Scholarships, &c., apply to the Head Master, or to the Rev. Philip P. Rowe, M.A., Secretary, Tettenhall, near Wolverhampton.

WINTER TERM, from JAN. 16 to APRIL 15.

A large Swimming-bath is now provided on the college premises.

MILL HILL SCHOOL, MIDDLESEX.

HEAD MASTER—
RICHARD F. WEYMOUTH, Esq., D. Lit. and M.A., Fellow of Univ. Coll., Lond.; Member of the Council of the Philological Society, &c., &c.

VICE-MASTER—
Rev. ROBERT HARLEY, F.R.S., F.R.A.S., Corresponding Member of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester, Member of the London Mathematical Society, formerly Professor of Mathematics and Logic in Airedale College, Bradford, &c.

ASSISTANT MASTERS—
JAMES A. H. MURRAY, Esq., LL.D. (Edin.), B.A., F.E.L.S., Member of the Council of the Philological Society, one of the Editors of the Publications of the Early English Text Society, Assistant Examiner in English in the University of London, &c., &c.
JOHN M. LIGHTWOOD, Esq., B.A. (Lond. and Camb.), Fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge; First Class in Mathematics at the University of London.
WILLIAM GREY, Esq., M.A., late Scholar of Exeter College, Oxford, First Class in Moderations, Second Class in the Final Classical Schools.
A. ERLEBACH, Esq., B.A. Lond.
G. EMERY, Esq., B.A. Lond.

LADY RESIDENT—Miss COOKE.

The LENT TERM commenced THURSDAY, January 20th.

For Prospectuses and further information, apply to the Head Master, at the School, or to the Secretary, the Rev. R. H. MARTEN, B.A., Lee, S.E.

Published by W. R. WILLCOX, at No. 18, Bouverie Street, London; and Printed by R. K. BURT and Co., Wine Office Court, Fleet Street, London.—Wednesday, March 8, 1876.